



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 1995

No. 99

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BURTON of Indiana].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 16, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAN BURTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

With hearts of gratitude and praise, O gracious God, we offer our thanks for Your Word that points us in the right way, that accompanies us in the valley of the shadow, that never abandons us though we forget or despise, that inspires and encourages us no matter what the concern, that forgives us and pardons us of all guilt, that reminds us that in all the moments of life we are never alone, for Your Word of faith and hope and love is with us always. 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 American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the exhibition of the RAH-66 Comanche helicopter.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will accept five 1-minutes from each side.

IN DEFENSE OF DEFENSE

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the defense budget has not been a high priority for Mr. Clinton. I think it is important, however, for us to remember that the greatest portion of the defense dollars that are spent are not spent on SDI nor on the B-2 bomber.

We spend the biggest share of our defense dollars on people, the young enlisted personnel who catapult the F-14's off carriers, control military satellites, man Patriot missile batteries, and land on beaches from Normandy to Somalia. These men and women who travel in harm's way for our sake are the ones who are hurt by inadequate defense spending.

We have begun yesterday and again today the process of rebuilding our national defenses. Because of our fiscal crisis, it won't be as much as some of us would like but it is a down payment. Remember, most defense goes to the men and women who protect us every day. That is what you will find in today's military construction appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, history has proven to us that when we see the daylight of peace on the horizon, we tend to disarm and bask in the sunshine. We need to remember that the darkness of war can be only a few hours away.

DO NOT BALANCE THE BUDGET ON THE BACKS OF OUR CHILDREN AND SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are all in agreement, Democrats and Republicans; we must put the financial affairs of our country back in order. Our huge national debt, the legacy of the Reagan and Bush administrations, must be eliminated.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is how to cut and what to cut. The Republicans in Congress want to cut school lunches for our children, cut our student's college loans and cut Medicare for our senior citizens. This is how the Republicans propose to balance the budget.

Students will have to pay thousands more to attend college and our parents and grandparents will have to spend an extra \$1,000 per year for their health care.

At the same time the Republicans propose giving a tax break to the wealthiest people in America, the super rich, the top 1 percent. This approach, is wrong, just plain wrong.

Mr. Speaker, when are the Republicans in this House going to realize

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H6047

that the American people want to get the financial affairs of this country in order, but not on the backs of our children and senior citizens and not while giving tax breaks to the richest people in America.

GET ON THE REFORM BANDWAGON

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, in New Hampshire this past weekend, President Clinton agreed with Speaker GINGRICH that Medicare is in trouble. In his own words, he said, "We cannot leave the system the way it is. There have to be some changes."

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see the President of the United States recognizes a problem that affects millions of senior citizens in our country. However, I can't help thinking how nice it would be now to actually see Democrats produce some solutions to these problems.

Unfortunately, the Democrats around here have no ideas on how to fix the current Medicare crisis. Instead, they stand up day after day to whine and moan and complain about Republican actions on Medicare.

It would be nice to see the Democrats divert some of their energy into helping us develop solutions to preserve and protect Medicare. Join the President, join the Republicans. Let's preserve and protect a very good Medicare system. Stop whining, stop complaining, get on the reform bandwagon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A "CORRECTIONS CALENDAR IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES"

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-144) on the resolution (H. Res. 168) amending clause 4 of rule XIII of the rules of the House to abolish the Consent Calendar and to establish in its place a Corrections Calendar, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, for the last 30 years or so, most of the laws made by Congress assumed that Government was more efficient and more wise than any other institution in the country.

For instance, Medicare was implemented in the 1960's and was designed to provide health care, primarily to the elderly, based on the idea that Government could best distribute health care resources.

Since the creation, Medicare spending has increased dramatically. In fact,

Medicare part B has increased 5,400 percent since the creation of the program. Medicare is in such bad shape that even members of the President's own Cabinet admit that Medicare will be bankrupt in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, buried deep in the philosophy of programs like Medicare is the assumption that Government has all the answers. It does not. It is time for the American people, both Republicans and Democrats, to work together to save Medicare. It is not too late to preserve and protect it before it goes broke.

WHERE'S THE BEEF?

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, for years Washington politicians have been asking, Where's the beef? I can honestly answer this morning, we found the beef. It is grazing on the beltway, 12 errant bovines on the beltway, running around recklessly, grazing at will, and some people say they are just restless, it is the breeding season.

I say, Mr. Speaker, they are looking for the budget. The President has one, the House has one, the Senate has one. The truth is the American people know there is a lot of bovine flatulence down here, and the American people want to know where the cash cow really is.

I say let's develop a budget that creates some jobs. Where's the beef politically? Sad to say, it is on the beltway.

IMPROVING CHILD-PROOF MEDICINE CAPS

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a rare example of how Government can work with industry—instead of against them—on regulations that will improve safety. I am referring to the decision by the Consumer Product Safety Commission on child-proof medicine caps.

New Jersey is home to 15 major pharmaceutical companies with over 83 facilities statewide. The industry employs over 56,000 New Jerseyans and contributes close to \$10 billion to our State's economy.

Child-proof caps have become so hard to remove—especially for our elderly—that adults leave the bottles open or switch the drugs to pill boxes, where kids can easily get into them. The result was that more children were ingesting dangerous substances.

In February, during a VA-HUD appropriations hearing, I asked that the commission work with industry to fix this problem. Yesterday's ruling does just that.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the commission and industry for working together. This is a win-win result and I am glad that I was able to play a part.

This rule should improve child safety and make older Americans' lives easier—what could be better?

FIXING A BROKEN MEDICARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, it is part of American conventional wisdom that if it ain't broke, then don't fix it, but Medicare is broke because it is going broke. The Medicare board of trustees said in March in their 1995 annual report on Medicare, that the program is severely out of financial balance and is expected to be exhausted in 2001.

It is broke because it is going broke. We have a responsibility to fix it. That is what this debate is all about. If you look at the numbers that we are talking about, the way that we fix it is in terms of numbers. We increase the spending from \$4,800 per recipient per year to \$6,400 per recipient per year. In other words, we go from about \$400 a month per person to about \$550 a month per person. But the real challenge is working out the details of how that is done.

I am confident that we can do that. I am confident that based on where the private sector has gone to squeeze out money in the medical system, that we can do it. But what we need is the help of the Democrats, we need the help of the President, we need the help of the public. We need our own people, and we need to all work together to come up with a solution that will in fact fix this system.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the budget that our President introduced this week. It is a thoughtful, fiscally responsible, and compassionate approach to the most difficult challenge that faces this governing body.

The President has included those items that are least justifiable in terms of the Federal role. It goes after the corporate tax subsidies, the most egregious ones. It follows up on the down payment we made on balancing the budget in 1993, the Omnibus Budget and Reconciliation Act, by keeping the spending caps on domestic discretionary programs.

Most importantly, it reforms the health care system. It has the insurance reforms that we have reached consensus on, that need to be made. It does not take money from the recipients of our programs in the way that most of the Medicare cuts that are included in the Republican budget do.

But what it does is to go after the providers, the providers that, in fact, have been taking most of the increase

in health care costs, the insurers, the facilities, and even some of the physicians. What we need is a reform that affects everyone, where everyone contributes a reasonable share to balancing the budget, to achieving what has got to be our Nation's foremost objective. The President's plan does that in 10 years, it does it in a responsible way, one that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle ought to support.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. 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 House under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Commerce, and Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

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 New York?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have been consulted about this request. We have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 167 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 167

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. 1817) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. (a) For purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as they apply in the House of Representatives to the Committee on Appropriations and to the consideration of general appropriation bills, amendments thereto, or conference reports thereon, the Congress shall be considered to have adopted House Concurrent Resolution 67 in the form adopted by the House on May 18, 1995.

(b) The allocations of spending and credit responsibilities to the Committee on Appropriations that are depicted in House Report 104-120, beginning on page 144, shall be considered as the allocations required by section 602(a) of that Act to be included in the joint explanatory statement of the managers on a conference report to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) This section shall cease to apply upon final adoption by the House and the Senate of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

□ 1020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 167 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislation in an appropriations bill, and also waives clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations, against provisions of the bill.

Additionally, the rule provides that the spending and credit allocations to the Committee on Appropriations con-

tained in the House-passed budget resolution shall apply for budget act enforcement purposes until final adoption of a budget resolution. Under the rule, the chair may accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the waivers provided in this rule are necessary since the defense authorization bill has not yet become law. I'm not aware of any objection to such waivers, and there was bipartisan support for this rule by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and by the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a special occasion that deserves proper recognition. As Members know, our colleague from Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, is the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction. She is the first woman to chair an appropriations subcommittee in 40 years. And all I can say, Mr. Speaker, it is about time and I cannot think of anyone more deserving of this distinction than Mrs. VUCANOVICH. She has served this Congress with dedication and commitment for over 12 years, and she is one of the most highly respected Members of the House. I applaud her hard work and bipartisan spirit in working together with the ranking minority member, BILL HEFNER, in bringing forward this first of the 13 appropriation bills. They did an outstanding job of addressing the important housing needs, base realignment and closure costs, and construction requirements of the military.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that about one-eighth of all military families living off-base reside in substandard housing. Additionally, more than one-half of the on-base family housing units are unsuitable and in need of significant repair. We've all heard stories of military families whose standard of living is so low they qualify for food stamps. This is deplorable, and we have an obligation to ensure an adequate lifestyle for those patriotic, dedicated men and women who have chosen to serve this country and are willing to put their lives on the line to defend America.

About 72 percent of the projects in this bill are for the construction of new barracks, family housing, and child development centers—money well spent in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, this open rule will allow all Members to fully participate in the amendment process, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following materials for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 15, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	29	74
Modified Closed ³	49	47	10	26
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	39	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of June 15, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1.	Balanced Budget Amdt.	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Natl. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1517	MillCon Appropriations FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has described, House Resolution 167 is the rule waiving points of order against provisions of the bill, H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The rule is essentially an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. It does provide waivers of clause 2 of rule XXI to allow unauthorized appropriations in the bill, as well as clause 6 of rule XXI prohibiting reappropriations. It also provides that figures in the House-passed budget resolution shall apply until final adoption of the budget resolution. There was no substantial opposition to these provisions from witnesses in yesterday's Rules Committee hearing.

In the Rules Committee hearing, however, Representatives BREWSTER and HARMAN did request an amendment known as the deficit reduction lockbox amendment. This would have allowed any savings obtained through floor votes to go into a special deficit reduction trust fund. Given the interest that many of us have in deficit reduction, I believe the Rules Committee should have made the Brewster-Harman amendment in order. Our ranking minority member, Representative JOE MOAKLEY, did offer the lockbox measure as an amendment to the rule. However, it unfortunately lost 8 to 3, with no Republican support.

Mr. Speaker, this bill appropriates approximately \$11.2 billion for fiscal year 1996 for military construction, family housing, and base realignments and closures for the Department of Defense. The bill appropriates approximately \$4.3 billion for family housing, \$3.89 billion for base realignment and closure costs, \$2.8 billion for military

construction, and \$161 million for NATO security.

Also included in the bill is approximately \$18.5 million in funding for several projects at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is partially located in my congressional district. I am pleased that the committee approved these funds which will continue several projects, including an electrical upgrade at the base. Mr. Speaker, these projects are important to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and to the community of Dayton, OH, which has been a world leader in aviation since the days of the Wright brothers. I commend my colleagues for including them.

Mr. Speaker, under the normal rules of the House, any amendment which does not violate any House rules could be offered to H.R. 1817. The rule was passed out of the House Rules Committee by voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman emeritus for yielding me the time. The rule certainly has been adequately explained by both the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], so I will not get into that. I will speak to the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, the military construction bill this rule makes in order will have a major impact on the morale and the quality of life of our young men and women who serve in our military today, and that is so critically important in maintaining a high quality of recruits, especially when we have to depend on an all-voluntary military as we do today.

We presently face a seriously worsening situation with respect to military housing, and this is a problem that simply must be solved if we are going to keep these young men and women in the service.

We cannot hope to recruit and then retain a high-caliber all-volunteer force if our service men and women are consigned to live in housing that we would not let our own families live in. This is how bad it is.

An estimated one-eighth of all military families residing off-base today are living in substandard housing, and that is terrible. More than half of all of our on-base family housing units are considered unsuitable and in need of significant repair.

Mr. Speaker, these are shocking and absolutely unacceptable conditions. I am pleased to note that funding in this bill for family housing is up 23 percent over last year. We found the money. This is so vital for the 60 percent of our service personnel who are married.

I am pleased to see that this bill provides the seed money for a 5-year pilot project involving the private sector to replace or renovate most or all of the on-base family housing units that are in dire need of repair today.

With Armed Forces composed entirely of volunteers, we find that our military personnel are staying in the service longer, they are marrying while in service, many of them are trying to raise families, and that is the way it should be.

There is an increase in this bill for the building and renovating of barracks that are used by our military personnel who are not married. This situation also needs to be addressed, because half of all existing barracks today are 30, 40, 50, and even 60 years old, and they are in a deplorable condition. We have a deficit on top of that of 160,000 barracks spaces to provide for quarters for these people.

So, I am just really grateful for the many good and necessary improvements made in this bill. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and all of the members of her subcommittee for bringing a really quality product to the floor

today. The investment we make today to improve the quality of life for our military personnel will pay off in the future, because we will find it much easier to recruit and retain and keep these good people that are serving us.

Having said all of that, I just want to again repeat what my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], said about the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. In bringing the military construction bill to the floor this week, my good friend from Nevada, who was formerly from my area up in upstate New York, the gentlewoman from Nevada, will become the first woman in 40 years to manage an appropriations bill in the House of Representatives. That is significant.

And as best as the staff of the Committee on Appropriations can tell, she will be only the second woman in the entire history of the House to have that responsibility. So, we salute the gentlewoman, let her come down here, and let us get this good bill going.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule for a variety of reasons, starting with the fact that this bill itself is unbelievably \$2.5 billion above last year, even while we are told that we have to reach a balanced budget which requires us to cut most programs in the budget over a 7-year period by about 30 percent.

It is to me incredibly irresponsible to be suggesting that we can raise any appropriation bill by more than 20 percent in a single year, given the budget squeeze we are facing.

But I think there is an even more basic reason to oppose this rule and that is because this rule would, in its passage, have it deemed that we had already passed the budget resolution when in fact that is not the case.

This bill is coming to the floor 2 weeks after the first appropriation bill came to the floor last year. There is still no budget which has been adopted by the majority party. This is the latest in 10 years that the Congress has been without the adoption of a budget.

Because we are still not operating under a budget, this rule would have the House, in essence, declare that it is simply the House budget resolution which is going to govern the appropriation process for the rest of the year, when we know full well that that resolution is going to have to be compromised with the Senate and a different set of numbers will be reached.

An added problem is that the budget priorities under which we are acting, and under which this bill is brought to the floor, are in fact grossly warped. While this bill is going to be \$2.5 billion above last year, the Labor-Health-Education appropriation bill will be about \$10 billion below last year, cutting a \$70 billion bill to \$60 billion.

You will see a savaging of the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program. You will see a merciless squeezing of

job training programs, of health appropriations, including a potentially very large squeeze on the National Institutes of Health. It just seems to me that that is an incredibly warped set of priorities.

I tried in the full Committee on Appropriations to get a different set of 602 allocations adopted for the subcommittee so that we could produce a different set of priorities. Instead of the outlandishly high military budget which is being enforced under this process, I suggested we simply go to what I would call *Domenici-plus-one*, which would say that we would limit defense expenditures to \$1 billion above that provided in the Senate budget resolution. That is hardly a left-wing proposition.

That level was supported by a number of well-known conservatives in the Senate who I would name if House rules allowed me to; conservatives in both parties. It would have allowed us, by limiting that defense expenditure to those levels, to provide \$900 million in additional support for law enforcement programs under Commerce-Justice, it would have allowed us to provide \$1 billion more for highway construction that will be allowed under the proposal which was presented by the majority.

We would be allowed to provide \$2 billion more to the VA-HUD bill to protect veterans' medical services and to help low-income seniors who otherwise are going to be clobbered in housing budgets.

It would have allowed \$100 million more to be used to toughen immigration enforcement. It would have allowed a saving of about a half-billion dollars on the squeeze that will otherwise be put in national parks, and it would have allowed us to reduce the incredible reductions which are going to be forced on student assistance, on biomedical research, and grants to local school districts and fuel-assistance programs as I indicated.

But because this resolution deems us to be operating under the House budget resolution, and because under that House budget resolution these warped set of priorities have been adopted, we cannot proceed to produce a more balanced set of appropriation bills if we proceed under this approach.

I want to make clear, I am not talking about spending one additional dime above the spending levels suggested by the Republican Party, by the majority party. What I am suggesting is that the way the dollars are allocated under the ceiling which we are all going to have to live with is grossly warped and this resolution, by deeming us to be operating under that procedure, simply guarantees that we cannot make any improvements in the situation.

I do not think we ought to do that. I think this rule ought to be defeated so that the entire proposal can be recommended to the Committee on Appropriations so that the committee can produce a different set of numbers which provide a greater sense of mercy and justice for working families who

are trying to help their kids go through school, for families who have health problems, for workers who need retraining, rather than sticking to the spending priorities which we are going to be required to stick to under this proposal.

□ 1040

So I would urge you to defeat the previous question on the rule, defeat the rule, send this whole proposition back to the Committee on Appropriations so we can produce a much more balanced set of spending priorities in a very tight fiscal year.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order an amendment to cut out what is a relatively small amount of money to purchase land for the construction of the U.S. Army Museum.

Now, if this were another time, if we were not all so much aware of the fiscal realities, the Army would have gone about this in the way that the other armed services have and, in fact, every other nation has, and build it with public funds. But the Army is not asking for public funds to build the U.S. Army Museum. The museum is going to cost about \$72 million, and the Army is going to raise that through private donations. That is the kind of thing we have been encouraging the public sector to do, not to spend any money that is not absolutely necessary.

The small amount of money, however, that is in this appropriations bill, and we appreciate the fact that the chairperson of the appropriations bill, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], included it, is necessary because we cannot possibly raise enough money to purchase the land immediately and it has to be purchased immediately. Equitable Real Estate, that owns it, has plans to develop two highrise office buildings on this site.

Now, let me describe where it is because all of you have seen this site. It is on the gateway to Washington, DC. It is kitty-corner to the Jefferson Memorial, across the river, and it is on a line between the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial, and what would be the Army Museum. It is a small piece of land, just to the east of the 14th Street Bridge. Everyone will see it as they enter Washington.

The small amount of money that is necessary will enable us to purchase this land at a very reasonable cost, and then the Army will go about raising money for the museum.

The Army has about 500,000 artifacts to show. Most of them are warehoused. Nobody can see them. Many of them are priceless. The Army has a story to tell, the history of the United States, how the Army secured this Nation's liberty through war and sustained it through preparation for war in a responsible manner, and all of those junctures where the Army made major

decisions are going to be highlighted in this museum. It will have an inestimable value for the esprit de corps, not just of the Army but of all the armed services.

And we know that there will be 20 million American citizens who will be visiting this museum every year. It has perpetual value. That is why this small amount of money is very important, and it is important that we include it in an appropriations bill, not vote for the amendment that would eliminate it.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. I certainly agree with your position on the Army Museum. As a matter of fact, it is only an appropriation to buy the land because all else is going to be built by donations. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORAN. That is correct, I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Is it not also correct that all of the other services have a national type of museum but the U.S. Army does not?

Mr. MORAN. They do. And it is ironic that the Army has the most to show, things dating back to the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the War of 1812, unbelievable things that this country has no awareness of the fact that we have these and would like to show them to the public.

Mr. SKELTON. I certainly agree and compliment you on your position.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and would urge my deficit hawk colleagues to oppose this rule as well.

There has been much discussion in this Chamber about the importance of deficit reduction and balancing the budget. Mr. Speaker, this House needs to put its money where its mouth is.

This rule restricts the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment, which would guarantee all savings achieved from cuts in this bill would go solely for deficit reduction—savings could not be used for additional spending.

Mr. Speaker, if this House votes to cut a program on the floor, then I feel—as I think a majority of this House feels—that those savings should go only to deficit reduction, not be spent somewhere else. The Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment would guarantee this savings.

Only a few months ago, this House overwhelmingly voted to pass the lockbox amendment, 418 to 5. With that kind of support, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed the Rules Committee did not continue the commitment of deficit reduction. Instead, they restricted the Brewster-Harman lockbox from this bill.

This is the first of 13 appropriations bills to come to the House floor this year. We must not wait any longer by letting millions of discretionary dollars slip into the wasteland of Federal spending. Let us make our cuts count.

Vote "no" on this rule, and let us send H.R. 1817 back to the Rules Committee and make the Brewster-Harman lockbox in order.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Deficit hawks listen up: I am the Harman of Brewster-Harman, and this is the vote you have been waiting for.

By excluding the lockbox, the Committee on Rules is telling us that on the first appropriations bill of the season we are not prepared, let me repeat, not prepared, to force cuts to go to deficit reduction.

A little later today we are going to consider at least two cuts to this bill. Should they pass, I am telling your now that without the lockbox, they will not, hear me, not go to deficit reduction.

Why not? The answer is that the appropriators, both sides, and this is not a partisan claim, do not want to lose the ability to use saved money for other pet projects.

Let me explain how the lockbox, which an overwhelming majority of this House has already supported, works. It works this way: If we cut money from an appropriations bill and we do not at the same time on the public record reprogram it to something else, that money automatically goes into what we call a lockbox. When the House passes its bill, the lockbox contains our cuts. When the Senate passes its bill, the lockbox contains the Senate's cuts. And then in conference the conferees are limited, limited by this mechanism to coming up with a bottom-line figure that is somewhere between the House and the Senate cuts. In other words, the money cut cannot be reprogrammed. They money cut goes to deficit reduction.

This concept is overwhelmingly popular out in the land and, in fact, it is probably a better mechanism, or at least a faster mechanism, than the balanced budget amendment because it goes into effect immediately with enactment of the appropriations bill.

And I say that as a strong supporter in this Congress, and in the last Congress, of the balanced budget amendment.

Let me conclude by saying this: Casting tough votes means casting votes that could hurt at home, and this is the case for me. Most people here know, and I always say it, I represent the aerospace center of the universe, California's 36th Congressional District. I am a strong defense hawk. I spoke for and voted for the plus-ups in the defense budget because I believe in them.

I certainly believe in spending on military construction.

But I also believe in two other things, and they are relevant today. One is candor. If we are serious about cutting the deficit, let us do it. And the second one is making sure that when I stand here and say that something really is deficit reduction, it really is.

And so I tell my constituents right now that by doing this, by voting against this rule and by voting against this bill, I am fighting for you because I am fighting for deficit reduction and candor in this House.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in strong opposition not only to the rule but to this bill, and I say, "Wake up, America. Stay tuned America," because under this bill and the next defense appropriation bill, we are going to spend a whole bunch of money. We are going to have increases in that spending, and at the same time, under the Republican budget, you are going to see cuts, drastic cuts, radical cuts in Medicare for our senior citizens. We are going to see programs such as the heating assistance for the poor in my district cut out completely, but we are going to see, like I said, spending increases in defense.

There is no shared sacrifice here. The reasons that you have to cut the Medicare as they cut Medicare is not only the defense increases but also because they have in their budget a big tax break for the wealthy, a \$20,000 tax break, \$20,000 a year for people making over \$250,000. That is not strengthening Medicare. That is not improving Medicare. That is not making Medicare any better. That is making it harder on my senior citizens, my rural hospitals.

I have got rural hospitals out there that right now estimate that it is going to be over a million-dollar loss in revenue to them by the end of this century just because you can give tax breaks to the wealthy and you can increase defense spending.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this movement of the Republican radical majority in order to take it out of the hides of the elderly and give it to our defense spending and to the wealthy.

For that reason, I oppose the rule, and I oppose the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about this rule because it does not allow the lockbox. It does not allow us to vote on the lockbox.

I am concerned about that because I have an amendment which would delete \$14 million from this bill which would go to build or to purchase land here in Washington, DC, for another Army Museum. This is another.

Another Army Museum, folks, would be the 49th Army Museum in this country. I cannot understand why we want to build a 49th museum right here in Washington when we have got American men and women who are needing training, who have family housing that is just unacceptable.

I think too many people have been talking to the generals and the brass, and they ought to get out there and talk to the men and women who serve in this Army and they ought to talk to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I just think it is a shame, and I cannot wait for us to vote on the cutting of the money for the Army Museum, but I sure wish it was being locked into deficit reduction or could be sent somewhere else, like family housing.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], on the previous question, but that is not because I am opposed to this rule. I want to commend the chairman. I will support the rule, and I will give the procedural vote to my party.

But I want to say this: Pigs get fat, hogs get slaughtered.

There is a way to go about this business in this whole process, and I want to thank the Committee on Appropriations for funding the three projects I had requested at the Air Force base, reserve base in Vienna, OH, to my ranking member, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and all the chairmen responsible, the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], thank you, but you see, I did it the right way. I requested it. And then it was evaluated, and then it was scrutinized, justified, then it was authorized, and then it went to the appropriators, and I showed that process, and I showed the importance of it and the merit of it, and it was funded.

And the process can work if we first authorize, justify, scrutinize.

And I am going to support this bill. As long as the appropriators are including those issues that are properly addressed through the authorizing process, you will have my vote.

I appreciate that, and I want to thank the chairman from Ohio for giving me the time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to stand up and speak right now because I am so agitated.

But, you know, I hear all of these new-found deficit hawks up here talking. And I have the National Taxpayers Union ratings here for the last 16 years, and I guess we know who the deficit

hawks are and who are not. I do not have much faith in new deficit hawks because if they were really deficit hawks, they would be up here voting for cuts day in and day out, like you do, Mr. Acting Speaker.

As a matter of fact, later this afternoon I am going to be introducing a piece of legislation that is about as thick as my briefcase is here. It is \$840 billion in spending cuts, and I am telling you it cuts just about everything and it brings the deficit under control that is killing this country, that is literally ruining the country.

We are going to give this, this bill which is this thick, we are going to give it to all of the appropriators and to any other of the 435 Members. They can take little pieces of the bills as these appropriations bills come down and all of the other bills and the reconciliation, and they can take it, you can, Mr. Speaker, or I can, anyone can take one little section. It is all there in legislative language, so all Members have got to do is come to me or come to the bill drafting office, and they have it there for you. They will give it to you, the specific amendment you want.

So the point is, let us see who the real deficit hawks are.

Now, I happen to support the Army Museum because it is a small amount of money. Somebody said, "Well, \$14 million is not a small amount of money." But it is because it is the seed money which will bring the Army Museum about.

I do not see amendments up here wiping out the Korean War Memorial. We are going to have an opening on April 27. We are going to have those who served in the military during the Korean war. We are going to have them coming to Washington. It is going to be a great day because we are going to honor those Korean war veterans. I did not serve in combat myself. I served in the United States Marine Corps during that period of time. It is going to be so gratifying to see that war memorial finished for those veterans who did, especially for the lives lost there.

All of these artifacts that the Army has, my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] was talking about, what is wrong with having a museum for the people who served, whether in World War I or World War II or the Korean war or the Vietnam war? Why can they not have a place to come? I think it is terribly important.

The bill also then allows for the volunteers to come out and raise money, like we did for the Korean War Memorial, like we did there.

I am going to tell you one thing: I hope no Republican votes for that cut when it is offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] or anybody else. I expect them to let that bill pass and let us get that war memorial built.

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

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

Mr. BROWDER. Would my friend tell me, do you know whether the Citizens Against Government Waste favor that expenditure for these, for this Army Museum, or oppose it, the Citizens Against Government Waste?

Mr. SOLOMON. I have got their ratings for however long they have been in effect. Yes, you are right, they do, and maybe the National Taxpayers Union. But sometimes they flake off, you know, too. They do it sometimes on some of these silly environmental laws sometimes. We know where this thing stands.

I want every Republican to come to this floor and vote against the Browder amendment, and I hope some good Democrats over there do, too. I know a few that will.

Mr. BROWDER. I thank the gentleman for admitting that the Citizens Against Government Waste are opposed to this museum.

Mr. SOLOMON. Now let me make one more point. We are trying to leave here by 2 o'clock at the request of all of the family-friendly Members, as my colleagues know. Where is my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]? He is up here every Friday wanting us to be family friendly, and we want to be. We are trying to get out of here at 2 o'clock this afternoon because there are a lot of Members who really need to go home this weekend to talk about Medicare and other things to their senior citizens. They are going to miss those planes if we go much longer.

Now there is a previous question coming on something called the lockbox. Now I happen to be a strong supporter of the lockbox, but the truth of the matter is, if we allow that amendment to go through today, it would be knocked out on a point of order even if the previous question is defeated, even if it is defeated. So it is a wasted vote. My colleagues would be wasting the time of the Democrats and the Republicans.

I say to my colleagues, If you don't like the way the rule is written, it's an open rule. Any Member can offer any kind of germane amendment that he wants if you don't like that, then vote against the rule. That's your prerogative, but don't waste the body's time with this previous question that's going to add another 35 to 40 minutes to the debate today, and all of these Members are not going to be able to get home on time for the weekend and do those kinds of things for their constituents.

So I would urge my colleagues, please support the previous question and vote how you want to on the rule. That's your prerogative.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the former chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, a great American, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and,

about the Browder amendment, it should be pointed up in this war museum that the gentleman from Alabama is trying to eliminate there will be a section in there honoring the National Guard and Reserve, and I point out that in World War II, the 29th Division, it was a National Guard division, that 2,000 young men, National Guardsmen, lost their lives landing at Omaha Beach, and they will be honored in this museum, and they ought to know that, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, they most certainly will, and when that museum opens, I want to go with the gentleman to be the first ones to visit.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to my very good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding.

Let me just ask my colleagues from New York on the Browder amendment: Isn't it true we're going to get over \$5 in contributions for every dollar we invest in this museum?

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely, because the American people live by the words "pride, patriotism and volunteerism." The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. DAVIS. And I understand there are over 500,000 artifacts sitting out there now, and some of these, frankly, face the fact that they could be lost over time if we do not find a permanent place for them.

Mr. SOLOMON. They could be lost, and also they could deteriorate and be destroyed.

Mr. DAVIS. And I guess the last question to ask is: The particular piece of property that we have in mind is, of course, adjacent to the Capitol and Arlington Cemetery in those areas, but we may lose this piece if we don't act within this next year; isn't that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. It could very well be so. We almost even did not get the space for the Korean War Memorial.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I plan to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in opposing the amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill, and I support the bill.

Let us set one thing straight for the Committee on Rules. They could have crafted a rule that would have done no harm to this bill, that would have made in order the lockbox amendment. That is a pretty bold assessment that they are putting up here. It could have been in order, would have done no harm to this bill, and it would have done what the people who had signed on to the lockbox amendment long ago wanted. It was absolutely done away

with in the budget considerations, so let us not say it would have been out of order. It could have been in order but for the rule that was crafted. They could have crafted a rule that would have made it in perfect order for the lockbox amendment to be offered in this bill, and it would have done no damage to the military construction bill.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me just say that the gentleman just does not understand the rule, that if the previous question were defeated and do not interrupt me, if the previous question were defeated, and then this was brought back to make this in order, it would, in my opinion, still be subject to a point of order. I cannot speak for the Parliamentarian, but from all previous precedents I know that that would be ruled out of order, and it would not be back here.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that that was not the question. If we could have passed the amendment in the Committee on Rules yesterday that was voted down, I believe 8 to 3, it would have been in order to offer this amendment with the proper waivers, and that was the question that he asked, not if, in fact, we defeat this previous question.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand a lot of things around here, but I do understand rules. I have been in this House for 20 years, so for the gentleman to tell me I do not understand the rules is a little bit ludicrous.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just tell the gentleman I have been here for just about as long, and, if he looks at all these rules here, we can all stand a little learning sometime.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any more speakers. I would only say that I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and, if the previous question is defeated, I would offer an amendment that would make in order the Brewster-Harman deficit reduction lockbox amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Proposed amendment to House Resolution 167: At the end of the resolution, add the following:

"SEC. 3. Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, an amendment on the subject of the deficit reduction lockbox to be offered by Representative Brewster of Oklahoma and Representative Harman of California and submitted to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD no later than June 16, 1995."

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 180, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—223

Allard	Cunningham	Hobson
Army	Davis	Hoekstra
Bachus	Deal	Hoke
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Horn
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Barr	Dornan	Houghton
Barrett (NE)	Dreier	Hunter
Bartlett	Duncan	Hutchinson
Barton	Dunn	Hyde
Bass	Ehlers	Istook
Bateman	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Bereuter	English	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Ensign	Jones
Bilirakis	Everett	Kasich
Bliley	Ewing	Kelly
Blute	Fawell	Kim
Boehlert	Fields (TX)	King
Boehner	Flanagan	Kingston
Bonilla	Foley	Klug
Bono	Forbes	Knollenberg
Brownback	Fowler	Kolbe
Bryant (TN)	Fox	LaHood
Bunn	Franks (CT)	Latham
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	LaTourette
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Lazio
Burton	Frisa	Leach
Buyer	Funderburk	Lewis (CA)
Callahan	Ganske	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Gekas	Lightfoot
Camp	Gilchrest	Linder
Canady	Gillmor	Livingston
Castle	Gilman	LoBiondo
Chabot	Goodlatte	Frost
Chambliss	Goodling	Furse
Chenoweth	Goss	Gejdenson
Christensen	Graham	Manzullo
Chrysler	Greenwood	Martini
Clinger	Gunderson	McCollum
Coble	Gutknecht	McCreey
Coburn	Hancock	McDade
Collins (GA)	Hansen	McHugh
Combest	Hastert	McInnis
Cooley	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh
Cox	Hayworth	McKeon
Crane	Hefley	Metcalf
Crapo	Heineman	Meyers
Creameans	Herger	Mica
Cubin	Hilleary	Miller (FL)

Molinari	Rohrabacher	Stump
Moorhead	Ros-Lehtinen	Talent
Morella	Rose	Tate
Myers	Roth	Taylor (MS)
Myrick	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Nethercutt	Royce	Thomas
Neumann	Salmon	Thornberry
Ney	Sanford	Tiahrt
Norwood	Saxton	Upton
Nussle	Scarborough	Vucanovich
Oxley	Schaefer	Waldholtz
Packard	Schiff	Walker
Paxon	Seastrand	Walsh
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Pickett	Shadegg	Watts (OK)
Pombo	Shaw	Weldon (FL)
Porter	Shays	Weldon (PA)
Portman	Shuster	Weller
Pryce	Skeen	White
Quillen	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Quinn	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Radanovich	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Ramstad	Solomon	Young (AK)
Regula	Souder	Young (FL)
Riggs	Spence	Zeliff
Roberts	Stearns	
Rogers	Stockman	

NAYS—180

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

NOT VOTING—31

Ackerman	Dickey	Jefferson
Archer	Dooley	Klecicka
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Largent
Chapman	Ehrlich	Matsui
Clay	Flake	Mineta
Clayton	Gallagher	Moakley
Collins (IL)	Gephardt	Parker
Coyne	Hayes	Pelosi

Schumer	Thornton	Yates
Smith (NJ)	Torkildsen	
Stokes	Tucker	

□ 1126

Mr. WARD and Mr. VISCLOSKEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. 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 245, noes 155, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—245

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Kasich
Allard	Dornan	Kelly
Archer	Dreier	Kim
Army	Duncan	King
Bachus	Dunn	Kingston
Baker (CA)	Emerson	Klug
Ballenger	English	Knollenberg
Barr	Ensign	Kolbe
Barrett (NE)	Everett	LaHood
Bartlett	Ewing	Latham
Barton	Fawell	LaTourette
Bass	Fields (TX)	Laughlin
Bateman	Flanagan	Lazio
Bereuter	Foley	Leach
Bevill	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Ford	Lightfoot
Bilirakis	Fowler	Linder
Bliley	Fox	Livingston
Blute	Franks (CT)	LoBiondo
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen	Longley
Boehner	Frisa	Lucas
Bonilla	Funderburk	Manzullo
Bono	Ganske	Martini
Brownback	Gekas	McCollum
Bryant (TN)	Gilchrest	McCreey
Bunn	Gillmor	McDade
Bunning	Gilman	McHugh
Burr	Goodlatte	McInnis
Burton	Goodling	McIntosh
Buyer	Goss	McKeon
Callahan	Graham	McNulty
Calvert	Greenwood	Metcalf
Camp	Gunderson	Meyers
Canady	Gutknecht	Mica
Castle	Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hancock	Molinari
Chambliss	Hansen	Mollohan
Chenoweth	Hastert	Montgomery
Christensen	Hastings (WA)	Moorhead
Chrysler	Hayworth	Morella
Clinger	Hefley	Murtha
Coble	Hefner	Myers
Coburn	Heineman	Myrick
Coleman	Herger	Nethercutt
Collins (GA)	Hilleary	Neumann
Combest	Hobson	Ney
Cooley	Hoekstra	Norwood
Cox	Hoke	Nussle
Cramer	Horn	Ortiz
Crane	Hostettler	Oxley
Crapo	Houghton	Packard
Creameans	Hunter	Parker
Cubin	Hutchinson	Paxon
Cunningham	Hyde	Petri
Davis	Inglis	Pickett
Deal	Istook	Pombo
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Portman
Dicks	Jones	Pryce

Quillen	Shadegg	Thornberry
Quinn	Shaw	Tiaht
Radanovich	Shays	Torricelli
Ramstad	Shuster	Trafficant
Rangel	Sisisky	Upton
Regula	Skeen	Vucanovich
Riggs	Skelton	Waldholtz
Roberts	Smith (MI)	Walker
Roemer	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Rogers	Smith (WA)	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Solomon	Watts (OK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Roth	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Roukema	Stearns	Weller
Salmon	Stockman	White
Sanford	Stump	Whitfield
Saxton	Talent	Wicker
Scarborough	Tate	Wilson
Schaefer	Tauzin	Wolf
Schiff	Taylor (MS)	Young (AK)
Seastrand	Taylor (NC)	Young (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Tejeda	Zeliff
Serrano	Thomas	

NOES—155

Andrews	Geren	Neal
Baesler	Gibbons	Oberstar
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Obey
Barcia	Gordon	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Green	Orton
Becerra	Gutierrez	Owens
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Bentsen	Hamilton	Pastor
Berman	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Bonior	Hilliard	Peterson (FL)
Borski	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Holden	Pomeroy
Brewster	Hoyer	Poshard
Browder	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Jacobs	Reed
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rivers
Cardin	Kanjorski	Rose
Clement	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Condit	Kennelly	Sanders
Conyers	Kildee	Sawyer
Costello	Klink	Schroeder
Danner	LaFalce	Scott
de la Garza	Lantos	Skaggs
DeFazio	Levin	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Dellums	Lincoln	Stark
Deutsch	Lipinski	Stenholm
Dingell	Lofgren	Studds
Dixon	Lowe	Stupak
Doggett	Luther	Tanner
Doyle	Manton	Thompson
Durbin	Markey	Thurman
Edwards	Martinez	Towns
Engel	Mascara	Velazquez
Eshoo	McCarthy	Vento
Evans	McDermott	Visclosky
Farr	McHale	Volkmer
Fattah	McKinney	Ward
Fazio	Meehan	Watt (NC)
Fields (LA)	Meek	Waxman
Filner	Menendez	Williams
Foglietta	Mfume	Wise
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Woolsey
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Wyden
Franks (NY)	Mink	Wynn
Furse	Moran	Zimmer
Gejdenson	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman	Gallegly	Royce
Baker (LA)	Gephardt	Schumer
Chapman	Hayes	Smith (NJ)
Clay	Jefferson	Stokes
Clayton	Klecicka	Thornton
Collins (IL)	Largent	Torkildsen
Coyne	Lewis (CA)	Torres
Dickey	Maloney	Tucker
Dooley	Matsui	Waters
Ehlers	Mineta	Yates
Ehrlich	Moakley	
Flake	Pelosi	

□ 1135

Mr. HALL of Ohio changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution 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. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable absence, today I missed rollcall vote No. 386, ordering the previous question, and rollcall vote No. 387, on House Resolution 167. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on each of those rollcall votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 167 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1817.

□ 1136

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman and inform the membership that not only is this bill historic, but, in fact, the moment we are about to experience here with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chair of the Subcommittee on Military Construction handling this bill, is a truly historic moment for women and for men in our country, because, in fact, as she moves this bill today, this will only be the second time in the 200-year history of our country that a woman has chaired any of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, which is an exclusive committee.

The last such woman to handle such a bill was Julia Butler Hansen of Washington State who, at the age of 67, retired from this institution and chaired the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies at the end of her career.

I just want to congratulate the gentlewoman. The road here is still a dif-

ficult one for women and to rise and chair one of the most exclusive subcommittees is truly an honor. We are proud of you. Good luck with the bill and congratulations to the people of Nevada for sending you here.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewomen for those remarks. All we need to do now is get along with this and get this done.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present to the House the recommendations for the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. The funding contained in this bill reflects only 4 percent of the total defense authorization passed by the House yesterday, totals \$11.2 billion, and is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. This represents a \$500 million increase over the President's request and a \$2.5 billion increase over fiscal year 1995.

Only recently has public attention been given to the problems our subcommittee has been citing for several years: the quality and deficit of military family housing for our military personnel, the necessity for support facilities for our service members and their families, and the importance of providing an adequate working environment to improve productivity and readiness. The committee has heard testimony from many different spectrums regarding these problems—and, we continue to feel strongly that the funds in this bill significantly contribute to the readiness and retention of our military personnel.

The appropriation and authorization committees have worked closely to provide for the number one priority of the military—quality of life for the men, women and their families, who voluntarily serve. Not one single project is included in this bill that was not included in the authorization bill which passed yesterday.

There is no question that there is a crisis in providing adequate housing. I cannot emphasize enough what an important role this plays in retention and readiness. This is the number one concern of our military personnel. Many barracks still contain gang latrines, suffer from inadequate heating and cooling, corroded pipes, electrical systems which fail and peeling lead-based paint. Continuous maintenance is required. Over 600,000 men and women are living in troop housing and about one half of the barracks were built 30 or more years ago, with an average age of 40 years. Of this inventory, over one fourth are considered substandard, and the Department estimates it will take up to 40 years at a cost of \$8.5 billion to correct these deficiencies.

The situation with family housing is not much better. Two-thirds of the 350,000 family housing units in DOD's inventory are over 30 years old and require a substantial annual investment

to meet maintenance requirements. Over the years, the majority of these homes have gone without adequate maintenance and repair and a current backlog in excess of \$2 billion. This coupled with nearly 30 years and another \$3 billion to eliminate the deteriorated and failing inventory pose a serious problem to the services. The committee recognizes that a combination of several different approaches will be necessary to help meet housing needs. A total of \$4.3 billion, or 40 percent of this bill, is devoted to construction and operations and maintenance of the existing inventory. In addition, \$22 million is included to fund Secretary Perry's top priority to begin the implementation of a pilot project to encourage private sector initiatives to help eliminate the family housing crisis. The challenge to help resolve this problem is for a sustained overall commitment, by Congress and the administration, at funding levels that will reduce the deficits and increase the quality of living conditions in a reasonable period of time.

This bill is not just about housing, it is also about necessary support facilities for our service members and their families—facilities that are growing more important with increased deploy-

ments; and, the importance of providing an adequate working environment to improve productivity and readiness. The bill provides needed facilities, worldwide, to support air, sea, and land operations for our forces; and, those facilities necessary to maintain a vast array of weapons and equipment. Twenty-five percent of this bill, or \$2.8 billion, is devoted to military construction for these facilities. Also included under the military construction accounts is \$636 million to address the substandard facilities our troops must live in; \$207 million for environmental compliance; \$179 million for medical related facilities; \$108 million for chemical demilitarization and \$57 million for child development centers.

In addition, a significant portion of this appropriation—35 percent or \$3.9 billion, is to fund base realignment and closures. The implementation of base closures requires large upfront costs to ensure the eventual savings. Over 51 percent of the increase in this bill is applied toward the base closure accounts. This amount of funding will keep closures on schedule, includes \$785 million for implementation of the 1995 round now under consideration, and devotes \$457 million for environmental restoration at closed bases.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to thank the members of the subcommittee for their help in bringing this bill to the floor. We have worked in a bipartisan manner to produce a bill which begins to address the military's priorities. I want to express my deep appreciation to Mr. HEFNER for his commitment to this bill. When he was chairman of this subcommittee, he worked hard to provide badly needed quality of life improvements and many other programs that contribute to the well-being of our forces. He did this at a time these programs were not in the press and of such a high priority. As the ranking member, he has continued this commitment—his cooperation and insights into the problems we confront have been invaluable.

Mr. Chairman, I realize we are asking our colleagues to vote for a substantial increase. I hope as we debate this bill today they keep in mind that we are only talking about 4 percent of the total defense budget. But this \$11.2 billion directly supports the men and women in our Armed Forces—it increases productivity, readiness and recruitment—all very vital to a strong national defense. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join us in support of this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1817)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Military construction, Army.....	550,476,000	472,724,000	625,808,000	+75,132,000	+152,884,000
Military construction, Navy.....	385,110,000	468,086,000	588,243,000	+203,133,000	+100,157,000
Military construction, Air Force.....	518,813,000	465,866,000	578,841,000	+62,028,000	+83,188,000
Military construction, Defense-wide.....	504,118,000	857,405,000	738,332,000	+224,214,000	-129,073,000
Total, Active components.....	1,958,517,000	2,313,870,000	2,521,024,000	+564,507,000	+207,154,000
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	188,082,000	18,480,000	72,837,000	-115,245,000	+84,067,000
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	249,058,000	85,847,000	118,287,000	-130,789,000	+82,650,000
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	57,370,000	42,883,000	42,883,000	-14,407,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	22,748,000	7,880,000	19,855,000	-3,083,000	+11,738,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	57,098,000	27,002,000	31,502,000	-25,584,000	+4,500,000
Total, Reserve components.....	574,320,000	182,012,000	284,864,000	-289,378,000	+102,912,000
Total, Military construction.....	2,530,819,000	2,495,882,000	2,805,948,000	+275,129,000	+310,086,000
NATO Security Investment Program.....	118,000,000	178,000,000	181,000,000	+42,000,000	-18,000,000
Family housing, Army:					
Construction.....	170,002,000	43,800,000	128,400,000	-43,802,000	+82,800,000
Operation and maintenance.....	1,013,708,000	1,337,888,000	1,337,888,000	+323,888,000
Total, Family housing, Army.....	1,183,710,000	1,381,688,000	1,463,888,000	+280,286,000	+82,800,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:					
Construction.....	287,485,000	485,755,000	531,289,000	+283,834,000	+85,834,000
Operation and maintenance.....	937,599,000	1,048,329,000	1,048,329,000	+110,730,000
Total, Family housing, Navy.....	1,205,084,000	1,514,084,000	1,578,818,000	+374,554,000	+85,834,000
Family housing, Air Force:					
Construction.....	277,444,000	248,003,000	294,503,000	+17,089,000	+45,800,000
Operation and maintenance.....	824,845,000	849,213,000	863,213,000	+38,368,000	+14,000,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force.....	1,102,289,000	1,098,216,000	1,157,716,000	+55,427,000	+59,500,000
Family housing, Defense-wide:					
Construction.....	380,000	3,772,000	3,772,000	+3,422,000
Operation and maintenance.....	29,031,000	30,487,000	30,487,000	+1,436,000
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide.....	29,381,000	34,239,000	34,239,000	+4,858,000
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund 1/.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	+22,000,000
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense.....	75,588,000	75,588,000	+75,588,000
Total, Family housing.....	3,520,444,000	4,125,221,000	4,333,189,000	+812,711,000	+297,834,000
Construction.....	(715,281,000)	(782,030,000)	(853,884,000)	(+146,703,000)	(+180,934,000)
Operation and maintenance.....	(2,805,183,000)	(3,288,805,000)	(3,279,805,000)	(+474,422,000)	(+14,000,000)
Family Housing Improvement Fund.....	(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	+22,000,000
Homeowners Assistance Fund.....	(75,588,000)	(75,588,000)	(75,588,000)	(+75,588,000)
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part I.....	87,800,000	-87,800,000
Part II.....	285,700,000	984,843,000	984,843,000	+699,143,000
(By transfer).....	(133,000,000)	(-133,000,000)
Part III.....	2,322,856,000	2,148,480,000	2,148,480,000	-174,376,000
Part IV.....	784,589,000	784,589,000	+784,589,000
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts.....	2,878,156,000	3,897,892,000	3,897,892,000	+1,221,734,000
Procurement: General provisions 2/.....	-10,421,000	+10,421,000
FY 1995 Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 104-8).....	-100,800,000	+100,800,000
Grand total.....	8,735,400,000	10,897,895,000	11,197,895,000	+2,462,595,000	+800,000,000
Appropriations.....	(8,735,400,000)	(10,897,895,000)	(11,197,895,000)	(+2,462,595,000)	(+800,000,000)
(By transfer).....	(133,000,000)	(-133,000,000)

1/ Budget amendment submitted 8/2/95 (H.Doc. 104-80).
 2/ Budget amendment submitted 3/18/94 (H.Doc. 103-220, page 10).

□ 1145

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in general, I want to rise in support of this bill, and, of course, to complement the recommendations made by Chairwoman VUCANOVICH and the way in which the bill was put together. As chairman of this subcommittee I have in the past emphasized providing adequate funding for quality of life projects. For years many people would pay lip service to the concept of addressing our family housing and barracks deficits. We on this subcommittee understand perhaps better than any other group of members, that providing our men and women in the military with a decent place to live and raise their families is the key to readiness and retention, and we are actually doing something about it in this bill.

I applaud the chairwomen's continuing of this theme as she developed the recommendations for fiscal year 1996. The quality of life projects included in this bill will reduce the deficit of adequate barracks and family housing spaces, and will provide additional child care capacity in many locations.

At Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base several vitally needed projects have been funded. In particular the folks at Fort Bragg will benefit from a vitally needed new health clinic. The current facility is a two-story World War II building with no handicapped access and conditions that make it impossible to maintain sanitary operations. In addition two badly needed barracks projects have been funded along with a staging area complex. This will increase the readiness of our vital forces stationed at Fort Bragg.

It is my understanding that the bill is \$500 million above the President's request, and that this is based on the House budget resolution which added several billion to the President's request for Defense. The final number for Defense spending is pending before the Budget Committee's in their conference, and therefore the ability of the subcommittee to retain that \$500 million in additional funds is in some doubt. While I understand the committee's action to spend these additional funds, we will find ourselves with some difficult choices later on in the process.

The bill recommends \$11.2 billion in budget authority, and is consistent with the section 602(b) allocation. The bill contains most of the individual projects recommended in the authorization bill just passed by the House, and contains no unauthorized projects.

Of the funds added to the President's request \$202 million are for barracks, \$207 million is for family housing, \$34 million is for child development centers, and \$80 million is for medical programs and active component projects.

Of the funds added to the bill 72 percent are for these quality of life items.

There may be some amendments to this bill which cuts all or a portion of these added projects. I will oppose those amendments. After all the years of rhetoric on improving living and working conditions in the military, its time to act and approve this funding.

Finally, I want to compliment Mrs. VUCANOVICH for the way in which this bill was put together. The needs of many Members from both sides of the aisle were taken into account in the formulation of the bill, and it reflects a bipartisan effort. I would highly recommend that members support the bill.

I would also like to congratulate the staff that has worked so hard and so diligently to put this bill together.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge support of this bill.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1817, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

Just yesterday, the House passed H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for the coming year. Three hundred Members supported this measure. The House should also give similar support to this bill.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I can assure the House that this bill squarely addresses one of the most serious problems confronting the Department of Defense and the people who serve in our Nation's military services. That problem is the quality and availability of adequate troop housing and military family housing.

There is no question that there is a crisis in military housing. Over 600,000 single enlisted personnel are assigned to on-base troop housing facilities. The average age of barracks and dormitories is over 40 years. One-fourth of these facilities is considered substandard.

The situation in family housing is not much better. Approximately 218,000—or two thirds—of the homes in the housing inventory of the Department of Defense are classified inadequate. One-quarter of the homes in the DOD inventory is over 40 years old and two-thirds are over 30 years old. This aging military family stock has extremely high maintenance and repair needs.

To put something tangible behind these dry statistics, I have here some examples of the problem we are trying to fix.

The first photo was taken at the U.S. Air Force Base in Incirlik, Turkey. This is military family housing. If anything this illustrates what we are trying to deal with here.

This is a picture of family housing for junior enlisted personnel at NAS Lemoore in California. These homes are about 40 years old and are structurally unsound.

This is family housing at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, IL.

It look like a country that has been controlled by communism for 40 years, does it not? The buildings are falling apart, the wires are exposed. Again, this is family housing for our people we ask to serve in the armed services.

If you are in the armed services, where would you like to be stationed? The garden spot? Would that be Hawaii? Would you like to go to Hawaii to serve if you are in the armed services? If you do, this may be the way that your family is required to live. This is housing in Hawaii.

Is there any doubt that the present military housing situation is unacceptable? The Secretary of Defense has recognized that; the authorizing committee has recognized it; and so does the Appropriations Committee. Together, we are determined to put us on a path toward fixing the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I just received a letter from the Secretary of Defense, Dr. William Perry. Let me just share this with the Members:

In light of the House completion of its consideration of fiscal year 1996 DOD authorization bill and today's debate on the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Appropriations Act, let me again express my personal appreciation for the Members' support of your housing improvement initiative. Your leadership has been invaluable in moving this important program forward.

Our effort to improve family housing is the cornerstone of our effort to enhance the quality of life of those men and women who serve so valiantly in our armed forces. Your actions and those of your Committee on Appropriations counterpart have given us the momentum we need to address the serious deficiencies that exist today.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of the session, Chairman VUCANOVICH and I agreed that improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families would be our top priority. We also agreed that there would be no—and I stress no—unauthorized appropriations in the military construction budget. Working with our colleagues on the two subcommittees, especially Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. HEFNER, the two ranking members, we settled on a series of tough criteria to judge proposed projects.

Even more importantly, we reached a joint agreement on Milcon for the coming year which we have recommended to the House. The authorization bill is the appropriations bill. The degree of coordination, cooperation, and bipartisan spirit with which we have approached our work is unprecedented since I have been in Congress. This has not been a business-as-usual process; and this is not a business-as-usual bill.

Working with the military services, we have identified a number of unfunded and badly needed quality of life improvements in housing, child care,

and health care facilities that can be executed next year. We have funded solely those projects where the need is the greatest and the dollars can immediately be put to use. We have agreed on a strong quality of life package, and I would encourage every Member of this body to support this package. It does a great deal for those we ask to defend our Nation.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I would like to also congratulate the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for her leadership in the presenting of this appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment regarding the appropriations of \$14 million for an Army museum, or for land to buy, to purchase land that the Army museum will be built on. That is the issue here.

Let me tell the Members what this is not about. This is not about Democrat versus Republican. This is not about whether you are pro-defense or anti-defense. We have good people who are for this bill and for this museum.

□ 1200

There are some good people who are championing this. The question here is do we need to be spending taxpayer dollars for this purchase at this time?

There are several reasons why I think that we should oppose this purchase:

First, the Army already has 48 museums in the United States. I ask them in hearings, do you have any other museums? They tell me we have 48. But they want one here in the Washington, DC area so that they can have it in the monument corridor. I don't think we need a 49th museum at this price to the taxpayer.

Second, in effect we are doing this spending for a museum that does not contribute to national security, and we are doing it with money that we do not have, since we are running the deficit deeper for this purpose.

Third, in a time of budgetary restraint, it is unreasonable to make this expenditure of public funds when private donations sufficient to cover the purchase are apparently available and are a more appropriate source of funding.

It has been said that this is not going to cost the taxpayer dollars because it is going to come from private donations. I imagine that is going to be a tax-exempt private entity that is going to be doing this, so the taxpayers are going to be underwriting it. Plus, the taxpayers are being asked to spend \$14 million to buy the land. I ask, the \$70 million that they are going to raise privately to pay for the museum, why can we not use that money to buy the land?

Next, should the Army, in fact, be unable to raise these private contribu-

tions required to build the museum, then the Government would simply be adding more land to its inventory without any benefit to the public.

The question of whether this land is going to be available: We have got to buy it now or we will lose it. It has been sitting out there since 1987. The same companies have owned it.

CBO estimates that my amendment saves \$14 million in budget authority and \$2.2 million in outlays.

I would like to close, Mr. Chairman, by reading one paragraph from a letter from the Citizens Against Government Waste. This letter is just issued today, the Citizens Against Government Waste. They say:

Finally, in the case of the land acquisition for yet another Army museum, we move to an unusual military theater of operations, the theater of the absurd. This will be Army museum number 49. How many museums do we really need while we're going another \$180 billion in debt next year?

"Moreover,"—Mr. Chairman, I wish we would pay attention to this, this is the Citizens Against Government Waste—"we believe there are questions of impropriety in a building site buy-out that looks like a bailout of a major corporation with taxpayer dollars." I hope that the Members of this body will pay attention to this.

If we need a new museum, it should be paid for by private funds, and not now when we are telling the taxpayers we have got to dig deeper, and we are telling the men and women in the military that we can't help them with the readiness any more or with housing any more, but we can do this. I think we should stop talking to the generals and start talking to the men and women in our military, and start talking to the American taxpayer.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Nevada, distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee Appropriations, yield for a colloquy?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman for her efforts in the military construction appropriations bill to put forth a military construction program that will increase the quality of life for our military troops as well as revitalize our national security posture.

I would like to reiterate the concerns I have already expressed about the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Center in my district in Pasadena, CA, which is the home of the 4th Low Altitude Air Defense Battalion, a frontline unit, several units of which were mobilized in Desert Storm. Here is a perfect example for a center which is run down, old, and probably unsafe.

In my discussions with the Marine Corps, they have expressed a desire to stay in Pasadena if we could demonstrate to them that we could solve their concern about inadequate and dilapidated facilities. The city of Pasa-

dena is willing to forgo the rent that has been paid in order to keep the center where it is. What is needed is approximately \$6 million to renovate the center. This is a primary example of what can be done in a cost-effective manner to revitalize existing military facilities.

Do you believe it is possible that this project may at some point in the future be included in some way as part of the military construction appropriation? I intend to continue to work with the authorizing committee of both Houses, and I hope we will be able to work together to ensure that projects such as this are included in the construction improvements put forth in fiscal year 1996 by this legislation.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I would like to assure the gentleman that we understand his concern and will continue to look into this matter. If the gentleman will keep us informed of his efforts with the authorizing committee, we will work together to try and find a solution.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], vice chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for the professionalism they have displayed in handling this bill.

The gentlewoman from Nevada has taken members of her subcommittee all over the country and all over the world looking at the terrible conditions our military people are living in. The trips she took us on were not pleasurable trips because we had to face the families of American servicemen who live in these squalid conditions. We had to look at broken pipes, and electrical connections that were even dangerous.

It is ironic that this time last year when this bill was before the House, there was very little controversy. I do not think there is going to be a big controversy on the fact that we are trying to better the quality of life for the men and women who protect us in the military.

Ironically, last year the only debate we had on housing was whether or not to give the Russians over \$150 million to build houses for their retired military officers. It is great that this year instead we are concentrating primarily on one of the most important things that this Congress can do, and that is to show the men and women who have come to us, and all the officers and all the people that represent the Government that have come to us and told us, "We need to recognize this tremendous dilemma we are in and we need to do something about it."

This bill does just that. It is a compliment to the ranking member and to our chairwoman and this brilliant staff she has assimilated in order to draft this legislation. Let me tell you, the Nation should be proud.

I know that every person in the military who is watching this program today is going to be appreciative of what we are doing for them and appreciative of the fact that the entire effort of this measure is to better their living conditions and to ensure they have a safe and a pleasurable place to live so they can do what they are supposed to be doing and not worrying about whether or not their family is safe at home or whether or not their roofs are leaking.

I compliment all of you today. I am proud to be a part of this subcommittee that has drafted this legislation. I know that my colleague from Alabama is concerned about minor parts of this bill, but let me tell all Members, this is a good bill just the way it is written and I think we ought to adopt it just the way it is written.

I thank the chairwoman for giving me the opportunity to express this, and thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for their compassionate understanding of the needs of these great men and women who serve us so well.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1817, and commend the chairwoman and the ranking member for their outstanding work.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I support the military construction appropriations bill, and particularly its commitment to family housing improvements.

In this aspect, the bill dovetails perfectly with what we have already passed in the Defense authorization bill.

That should be no surprise, because members and staff of both committees have worked very closely on this. As a result, both bills fund family housing above current levels, as well as above the administration request.

All of us have been concerned about military family housing problems over the last few years.

This is a critical component of readiness and quality of life that has not always had sufficient attention.

As outlined in my committee's report, we believe there are critical shortfalls in both quality and quantity.

Modernization and new construction have not progressed at the pace necessary to maintain our normal high standards.

Another aspect of the issue is that the All-Volunteer Force creates different kinds of housing needs.

Our military is in transition. It is no longer primarily made up of single men living in the barracks.

We have far more servicemembers—men and women—who have families and children.

Their housing needs are obviously different from those of people who served in the military even a few short years ago.

We have an obligation to keep up with this transition by ensuring that the great people who serve in the military have quality housing.

These issues are so important that I ask you: Oppose any effort to reduce our commitments to better housing.

Our military people and their families deserve the best we have to offer.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the perspective of my friend, the gentleman from Alabama. In fact, if the information that he believes to be the case were true, I would agree with him that we ought not go forward and build a surplus museum that represents a corporate buyout, but that is hardly the case. It could not be further from the case, in fact.

The reality is that this is a one-time opportunity, once in our lifetimes, probably in the history of our capital area, where we have one last opportunity to purchase the last major site in what is called the monumental corridor.

There is one last site left. It is kitty-corner to the Jefferson Memorial. It is on the gateway into the Capital. It is on line with the Washington Monument and Jefferson Memorial, and the private corporation that owns it wants to build high-rise office buildings on it. That is where the money is, that is where the profit is. If we do not act right now, they will do just that.

Every time we drive into the Nation's Capital, we see these big corporate office buildings at the edge of the river just before we cross the Potomac River, we will know that that is the site where we should have the U.S. Army Museum.

We have to act now. We cannot wait to raise private funds. That is what the Army would prefer to do. They do not want to have to pay for this with public funds, even though the other services pay for their national museums with public funds, and every other Nation has an Army museum that they have paid for with public funds. We need public funds only for the site acquisition, because it has to be done immediately if we are to preserve this site. That is why we need it.

The Army is going to raise \$72 million. We are not asking for the money to build the U.S. Army Museum. We are only asking for the money we need right now. In fact, it is less money than the administration requested and was authorized this past week in the national security authorization.

The money has been authorized. It is not going to any kind of pork project. We have to get it now. It is a small downpayment on what will serve this country into perpetuity.

Mr. Chairman, we have 48 museums around the country, I grant you that, but they are small museums, built for specific purposes. There is no national Army museum. In fact, the 20 million people that come to the Nation's Capital are going to realize the history of this country when they go to this Army museum, and all of us are going to be proud for the vote that we take today to protect this money, to make this small down payment.

There is no other way that we can show the 500,000 artifacts that have been created throughout our Nation's history, 220 years of collecting these priceless artifacts. We have got the Spanish American War uniforms, 19th century brick casements with 32-pounder guns. We have got a signal flag that was used at Little Round Top during the Battle of Gettysburg.

The purpose of this is to instill greater citizenship among the people who visit the Nation's Capital, and in fact to provide the Army with the kind of pride and esprit de corps that they deserve. All those families and relatives and friends of people who have served in the Army ought to have that opportunity when they come to the Nation's Capital, to see these priceless artifacts, to see the development of the United States Army, to recognize the importance we put on those people who have served this country.

In fact, we have more people who served in the United States Army than any of the other services, and none of the other services obviously are opposed to this. But we need to educate our citizens as well. People are losing a sense of history in this country. That is one of the reasons we are losing some of our civility, as well, as a society.

□ 1215

This museum will show our Nation what people sacrificed to bring us to where we are. And much of that sacrifice occurred within the ranks of the United States Army.

We have compelling reasons to keep this money in, and I would urge my colleagues to defeat the Browder amendment, to leave the small amount of money in.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a member of our subcommittee and president of the Republican freshman class.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the military construction appropriation bill, and I want to take special note of the fact that every single dollar contained in the bill is for authorized projects.

In addition, the budget resolution set a funding goal for this appropriation

and the bill meets that goal. I hasten to add that this appropriation bill is part of an overall spending plan that gives us a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The bill provides funding for military housing, airfield construction, infrastructure, for NATO, and base realignment and closure.

Our bill provides \$4.3 billion for family housing, an area where, sadly, Congress has proven to be far shortsighted over the past few years. We intend to make up for that oversight today.

The men and women to serve in our Armed Forces, Mr. Chairman, have truly earned the right to a decent place to sleep and eat and their husbands, wives, and children who are left behind when they are called away at a moment's notice also have earned the right to expect better treatment from their Government.

Further, it is true that our appropriation exceeds President Clinton's request by \$208 billion. Mr. Chairman, we do not have to be ashamed that we are demonstrating a greater commitment than the President has to the quality of life of those who serve in our Armed Forces. The committee simply put a higher priority on military quality of life than the President did. That is nothing to back down from.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say this is a good bill. We have based it on sound principles. And I remind my colleagues again that every single dollar appropriated has been authorized. The committee has prioritized the needs of our Defense Department and those who serve in uniform and their families. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and urge my colleagues to vote aye on final passage.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we are in a situation here in the summer of 1995 where we are attempting to figure out how will we balance the budget. We had the fortunate occurrence earlier this week with the President making a commitment to join with Congress to balance the budget in a time certain.

This exercise is not going to be easy. It is going to require sacrifice in all areas of the country, in all activities that the Federal Government sponsors. And if we do not truly have shared sacrifice, we sap, we undermine, the willingness, the ability of others in this great Nation to join in this deficit-reduction budget-balancing effort.

This is the first of several appropriations bills to come before the U.S. House of Representatives. The question I submit is not really can we justify, one way or another, individual projects in this bill which are being identified for elimination. To be sure, we can.

All of us like museums. All of us like to welcome guests to our Nation's Capital and point out the fine features. All of us want to support our men and women in the Armed Forces.

All of us want to make sure that we have bases that are the best equipped

in the world. But we cannot afford to do everything that each of us would like to do. The question is where do we draw the line? How do we draw the line? And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we need to draw the line in consultation with the President and using common sense.

Is a museum something that we can afford when we are trying to balance the budget? If that museum is on a site owned by the private sector and that site has been valued at just over \$10 million by the assessor in Virginia, why are we prepared to pay \$14 million to the private landowner?

If we have housing facilities that are costing more than \$200,000 a unit, let us ask: Is there not a way that we can do this better?

If we have facilities that are being built at bases and these facilities have not been requested by the Defense Department and by the administration, why do we need to do them this year? These are examples of things that are in this bill that we need to eliminate.

We need to send a message, not only to those men and women in this body that are composing the appropriations bills, but to the rest of the Nation, that balancing the budget is a top priority.

We cannot afford to increase by 28 percent military construction from 1994 to 1995, we cannot afford to increase by \$500 million military construction in this bill over and above what the Defense Department and the White House has requested.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the military construction appropriations bill.

This bill mirrors the authorization bill we passed yesterday, providing a much-needed boost to our military's quality of life.

For years, one administration after another has scrimped on the quality of life of our troops to pay for other priorities. In addition, we have been investing large sums in recent military construction bills to accommodate the base closure process. In fact, some 35 percent of this bill goes to base closure. While base closure investments will enable military consolidations that will reap significant dividends down the road, they also have had the effect of further squeezing our military personnel. The shortchanging of these personnel is finally coming home to roost.

Today, 60 percent of our military personnel are married, versus 40 percent only 20 years ago. Quality of life issues matter more and more. When coupled with the strains of extended deployments and uncertainties about military careers, substandard housing and other deficiencies mean that too many of our most talented military personnel are voting with their feet and leaving the military. We must act if we want to ensure that our fighting forces remain the best and the brightest.

Today we have an opportunity to do that. The bill before us includes a desperately needed \$4.3 billion for military family housing. This funding is intended to help address the severe shortage of adequate military housing that exists today—a shortage that affects some 300,000 military families.

In my district, Naval Station Mayport has not seen an investment in new or renovated housing for 11 years. Some 1,300 military families—roughly 8,000 military personnel and their dependents—are waiting for base housing that is not available.

As one chief petty officer at Mayport recently said about living on-base, "when I'm gone for six months straight, the base is its own little community, totally self-sufficient with everything my family needs, and an excellent security force. There is . . . a support system for my family while I'm gone."

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will not continue to shortchange our military personnel and their loved ones today by opposing this legislation. I urge their support for this bill.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I first would like to speak out in strong support of this legislation. As someone who represents 45,000 Army soldiers, I want to say thank you to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member, for having made a commitment to provide the quality of life for our military families that they so greatly deserve.

I would also like to speak out against the Browder amendment, which would strike the funding for any Army Museum.

I sometimes vote with Citizens Against Government Waste; I often-times vote with that organization. But I take offense that they would call the proposed National Army Museum a theater of the absurd. For any organization to call a museum that would be a tribute to the hundreds of thousands of men and women who served our Nation and been willing to put their lives on the line for our freedoms, for them to call such a tribute to those men and women that is absolutely unfair and unconscionable.

What is a museum? I think a museum is an education tool. In the case of the Army Museum, it could be a retention tool. It could be a source of pride for every young man or woman serving in the U.S. Army today or any person who has ever served in the U.S. Army.

Now, people can poke fun at museums and make them sound like pork-barrel projects. I want to tell the Members, of all the experiences I have had in Washington, DC, perhaps none has been more meaningful to me personally than the 3½ hours I spent one day with my wife in the Holocaust Museum, for

it was through that experience that a citizen of this country, born after the end of World War II, learned firsthand of the horror of World War II and the horror of tyranny at its worst at the hands of Adolf Hitler.

The Holocaust Museum did not glorify war and it did not glorify the Holocaust. Rather, it showed me and the thousands of schoolchildren who have visited since that our Nation must do everything possible to see that something like that tragedy never occurs again in the history of this world.

I believe an Army Museum can serve the same purpose. Such a museum would not glorify war, it would glorify those who sacrificed their full measure of devotion to see their country can have the opportunities and the freedoms that you and I enjoy today.

Such an Army Museum would also educate millions of young schoolchildren, 4 million of whom come to this Nation's Capital each and every year, and education those children that our Nation must do everything possible to see that we prevent war, that war, in fact, is not a glorious thing as sometimes it is shown to be on television, but war is a devastating experience to all those involved with it and all those affected by it.

So, Mr. Chairman and Members, I urge support not only for this legislation, but I would request your vote against the Browder amendment. Our Nation and our Army soldiers deserve a National Army Museum.

Mrs. VUCANOVIĆ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1817, the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Appropriations Act. This bill represents a reasoned approach toward addressing the shortage of quality housing within the Department of Defense. It also works to ensure the quality of life for the men and women who serve in the military. Approximately two-thirds of the family housing units in the Department's inventory are over 30 years old and require extensive maintenance. Furthermore, roughly one-half of all military barracks are also over 30 years old, with an average age of nearly 40 years. We should not expect the brave men and women in our Armed Forces to live in these conditions.

However, there is another compelling reason to support this bill. Recognizing the pressing needs of single military parents, dual military couples, and military personnel with civilian employed spouses, the Military Construction Subcommittee more than doubled the funding for child development centers. This is a significant step toward meeting the Defense Department's established goal of providing quality child care.

Nowhere is this pressing need more visible than at the U.S. Military Academy, which is located in the district I represent. H.R. 1817 provides funding for a single story, standard design child

development center to provide child care for over 300 children. Although there is a lengthy waiting list, the current facilities at West Point accommodate just over one-half that amount.

The present child development center is a 3-floor warehouse constructed in 1885, 100 years ago. The part-day preschool is located in a World War II-era wood building. Both facilities have structural problems that are simply to uneconomical to repair. Clearly, those working to prepare the U.S. Army's future leaders deserve the peace of mind of knowing that their children are receiving quality child care, in decent facilities.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1817 provides vital funding to improve the child development center problem at West Point and numerous other military facilities throughout the Nation. It also addresses the housing crisis throughout the Department of Defense in a reasonable, fiscally responsible manner. All of the projects in the bill have been authorized and the total appropriation is consistent with the budget resolution that this Chamber passed. Without the funding provided by this bill, we run the risk of eroding the readiness and morale of our troops. We cannot allow that to happen. I urge my colleagues to support the bill. Our service men and women deserve nothing less.

□ 1230

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], who is a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment our new chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee for the outstanding job that she has done in this new responsibility. She has been a long-time member of this subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking Democrat.

For many years, I served on the Military Construction Subcommittee and we had cut to a minimum, and I think cut too deeply, into the funding for military construction and for quality of life, and if we are talking about the readiness and the training of our people, you have got to have the physical facility on these defense bases. You have got to have housing. You have got to have the educational and training facilities. You have got to have physical training facilities. These things all are important to the sailors, to the Army, the Marine Corps people, and the bottom line here is you can make some very big mistakes by cutting back on these kinds of things, these quality-of-life items.

What happens is the people then bolt, and they leave the services, and you have a major retention problem.

I can remember Admiral Hayworth coming up in 1979 to the defense sub-

committee, which I have been a member of for 17 years. He says, "I am here to talk about what we have got to do to keep people in the services, and if we continue to let these facilities get worse and we do not deal with these problems in housing, physical training, all of these things that are important to the modern-era sailor and the modern-era person in the military, then they leave the services."

So I urge today that we support this bill, that we oppose the amendments that are aimed at taking out housing and training facilities, foundry at Philadelphia, so essential to maintaining some ability in the Government sector to producing propellers that is crucial to doing that important kind of work.

Let us support the committee and vote down these ill-considered amendments.

Mrs. VUCANOVIĆ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the 1996 military construction appropriations bill. I want to commend both Chairwoman VUCANOVIĆ and Chairman HEFLEY for their fine work.

In particular, I want to commend the two chairs for their initiative in addressing what we all agree is a tremendous problem, the widespread shortage and poor condition of military housing. In testimony before the milcon subcommittees this year, defense officials stated that, at current program levels, it will take years and in some cases decades to provide sufficient housing to our service men and women. As an initial down payment toward addressing this problem, this bill contains an additional \$425 million for the construction and improvement to military housing and troop housing. This addition will allow for the construction of nearly 1,200 family housing units, 20 new barracks, as well as substantial renovations to family and single family housing.

I know that the construction of roads and buildings does not grab the headlines like weapons procurement or foreign policy debates. But for the young soldier and his or her family who need clean, affordable housing, this bill can make a real impact in their daily life and may, in fact, make the difference as to whether they remain a "military family" or leave the service.

As a member of the National Security Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I have seen first hand the very real commitment to our military of both Chairwoman VUCANOVIĆ and Chairman HEFLEY and the ranking members, Mr. HEFNER and Mr. ORTIZ. This bill reflects their wise leadership and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have before me a letter from the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste. In this letter, there is a description of the proposed Army Museum as "the theater of the absurd." Mr. Chairman, every American should resent those words.

I was privileged to be part of the congressional delegation that represented America at the D-day commemoration last year, the hundreds of graves near Normandy.

I have also been, years ago, to the scene of another army defense, a place called Corregidor.

And for someone to write the words "the theater of the absurd," when you wish to commemorate brave and outstanding heroism of the past, is absurd itself.

Those men and women who wear uniforms today and have worn the uniform in the past make it possible for people like this to write words like this in a free land.

Mr. Chairman, in a larger sense, someone a few moments ago spoke of sacrifice. Let us not forget we ask sacrifice of the young men and young women in uniform.

For them to live in substandard housing is wrong. It is a disgrace. We should give them the very best that we possibly can.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill.

In the past several months, I have worked with both the Authorizing and Appropriations Committees on this bill and have been extremely impressed with their professionalism and commitment to producing a bill that provides the greatest possible quality of life improvements for our military personnel and their families.

I am curious about the concerns of the sponsors of the amendments to this bill based on my experiences with these two committees. While I am not a member of either the National Security Committee or the Military Construction Subcommittee, nor is anyone from the State of Iowa.

However, when the community of Sioux City presented the committee with the critical need for resurfacing the runway used by the 185th Air National Guard—a runway that is almost 10 years overdue for reconstruction—the committee listened to the case, agreed it was a priority, and included it in the bill.

The Military Construction Appropriations Committee evaluates projects on their merits. Sometimes that might result in a few changes from the administration's request, but this bill is under budget, it is properly authorized,

and it was put together by a chairwoman whose only concern is producing the best possible bill.

I am as tough on unnecessary military spending as any Member of this Congress, but the facts concerning the critical needs in this area speak for themselves.

Thanks to Chairwoman VUCANOVICH, the families of pilots who fly in the 185th will not have to worry whether their loved ones will be working under unsafe conditions any longer.

I applaud her work and support this bill.

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

I support this bill, and I will oppose amendments to this bill, and I plan to vote against the Browder amendment to cut funds for the museum.

But I would like to make a couple of statements. I have been, or was, chairman of the military construction for many, many years. With my ranking minority member at the time, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], we started this quality-of-life movement. Many years ago we visited bases all over this country and we found conditions that these people were living in were atrocious.

I would just like to make this point: I wish over the years that across the river the higher-ups and the generals would have made as much a priority of quality of life for our men and women in the service as they have gone to bat for this museum that we are considering here today.

As chairman of this committee, I remember years ago we did one museum for the Navy, and it was all paid for out of private funds. There were no taxpayers' money involved.

I guess what I just would like to say is that I am glad we are moving in the direction we now have on our committee. We have a committee here that looks after the living conditions of our men and women in service, and I would just hope that our generals in the Pentagon, both active and retired, would put as much a priority on the quality of life for our men and women in the service, as they do for a shrine here in Washington for the exploits of our brave servicemen over the years.

I plan to reluctantly vote against this particular amendment from the gentleman from Alabama. But I just wanted to say those few words because it perturbs me when I see the emphasis being so much on this one particular issue, while over the years the quality of life has been ignored before this committee over many, many years.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairwoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I stand today as a strong supporter of the military and of our national defense. I have a brother and a father who are retired military.

I also will support final passage of the bill. But I am a member of the

Committee on the Budget, and as such have spent the last few months working on the budget and cutting spending, et cetera.

I have a question on one of the amendments today relative to two particular requests that I understand were not requested by the military, by the Navy, in the appropriations bill. One of them is \$6 million for a foundry renovation and modernization in a shipyard which had been closed by the Base Closing Commission and, as I said, was not requested. The other is \$10.4 million earmarked for a physical fitness center in another shipyard that already has a physical fitness center. So, since the Navy did not request this, my question, very simply, is: I would like to ask that this amendment be supported for eliminating these two projects.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Act. Allow me first to congratulate the chairwoman on her hard work. This bill is about quality of life for our members of the armed services.

H.R. 1817 employs sage and sound reasoning. Everything contained in this bill was authorized, and is fully consistent with the House-passed budget resolution. But more importantly, this bill addresses the crisis of military facilities. The main concern of this legislation, as should be the case, is the quality of life for the men, women, and their families, who serve in the Armed Forces. This is not a pork bill.

This is a necessary bill. The past decade of declining defense budgets have come at a steep cost. Readiness and morale have suffered drastically. H.R. 1817 addresses this concern—300,000 military families lack adequate housing. Nearly two-thirds of all on-base housing is substandard. It is important to note that a full 40 percent of all funds in this bill will go directly to family housing.

In addition, this bill contains important and necessary funds for Camp Blanding, a National Guard installation in my district, as part of the funding for critical construction projects. These projects are required and necessary. They would be used to replace the waste water treatment system, which was built in the late 1930's. The existing system has already been in service for 15 years past its life expectancy. Furthermore, Camp Blanding has been issued a letter of noncompliance by the Department of Environmental Regulation for inadequate chlorine residuals. Their water exceeds the national secondary drinking water regulation's maximum contamination level for iron. Mr. Chairman, the amazing thing is that Camp Blanding is not an aberration, but typical of bases across the country. At the very least, our fighting forces need—they deserve—access to clean drinking water.

The military value of such projects should be obvious. Camp Blanding's inadequate facilities must be upgraded to meet military and

environmental standards. But more importantly, Camp Blanding's facilities must be upgraded because we owe it to our Nation's soldiers. They should not be forced to live in substandard and inadequate quarters. Mr. Chairman, we need to send a message to our forces that we care, that they are important to us. Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford not to pass this bill, for projects like Camp Blanding and all the other bases in similar positions.

This legislation is necessary for the readiness and morale of our Nation's troops. We must pass this legislation to improve the quality of life for our soldiers. They deserve our respect; they have earned it. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It contains sound principles and strong medicine for an ailing and antiquated base structure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote on final passage.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLETTA].

Mr. FOGLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct a statement made by the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who stated that a \$6 million project is being appropriated for a navy yard in Philadelphia which is being closed.

The fact is the navy yard itself is scheduled for closure, but the propeller shop and foundry is not scheduled. This is what this \$6 million is for, improvements to that facility, which is going to remain open and which is needed by the Navy.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that has been printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1817

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$625,608,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed \$50,778,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the

Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HERGER

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERGER: Page 2, line 12, strike "\$625,608,000" and insert "\$611,608,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support this amendment to the Army's military construction budget.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

□ 1245

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will object.

Mr. HEFNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, could the gentlewoman withhold that request until the gentleman finishes his remarks and I can find out how many Members want to speak on this bill?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to do that, and we will talk about it in between times.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will object to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is withdrawn.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support this amendment to the Army's military construction budget. This amendment eliminates \$14 million in taxpayer dollars to purchase 7 acres of private land for the purpose of building a national army museum.

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear, we should always strongly support our military, and I will continue to do so. This amendment does not, in any way, move to belittle the brave Americans that served or trivialize the tremendous sacrifices that they have made for this country. Indeed, I support the building of the A museum dedicated to the soldiers of our Nation's Army—I simply believe it should be built on existing Federal lands.

The issue here is not whether the museum should be built, but rather where it should be built and more importantly can the Federal Government afford the \$14 million price tag. I believe the American taxpayer would

agree that \$2 million an acre is a bit too much. Not only does this land acquisition cost the taxpayer, it denies private ownership and decreases revenues by taking the property off the tax rolls.

The Federal military already owns almost 650,000 acres of land when only 7 of which is needed for the museum. In fact, right here in the Washington area, we have Fort McNair, Fort Meyer, and the property surrounding the Pentagon that could be used to establish this museum. Mr. Chairman, I also understand that there may be a Federal department or two available in the near future. But my point is, I find it difficult to believe that the Army cannot find 7 acres somewhere in this country that would adequately accommodate the building of a museum. I do not see why we should spend additional taxpayer dollars to purchase more land when plenty of Federal property is already available.

If this Nation is to ever reduce the size of Government, then this Congress has to control spending where we can.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does precisely that. It cuts unnecessary Federal spending and sends a clear message to all Federal agencies, that this Congress is committed to not making the Federal Government any larger than it already is. Why should we allocate scarce taxpayer dollars for more land instead of utilizing abundant existing lands. It simply does not make fiscal or common sense. I urge my colleagues to save taxpayer dollars and vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], has offered his amendment which is similar to the Browder amendment. It is the same amendment. We are both supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it very clear we have heard some very impassioned pleas today which the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] and I will agree that we want to honor American men and women who have served in our military. We are very concerned about this. But what we are saying is that there is a way to do this without having American taxpayers spend this money that increases the national debt for a museum that is the 49th museum in the United States. We have plenty of space for this.

Let me point out a few things:

First, the Army already has 48 museums in the United States. They have them up here in this area. This land is not necessary to have a museum in the Washington area.

Second, in effect we are spending this money that we do not have for a museum that would be the 49th museum.

Third, in a time of budgetary restraint it is unreasonable to make this expenditure of public funds when private donations sufficient to cover the purchase are apparently available.

Fourth, if we do spend this money to get this land, it may be that we just add more land because we may not get the money from the private donations to buy it.

Fifth, the CBO estimates that my amendment saves \$14 billion in authority and \$2.2 million in outlays.

The Citizens Against Government Waste have written to us today about this issue saying we move through an unusual military theater of operations, the theater of the absurd. A museum is not absurd, and men and women who have fought in the military are not absurd, but this money spent in this way is absurd. How many museums do we really need when we are going \$180 billion in debt next year.

This is a very important amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I really do wish that people would talk to American men and women and American taxpayers rather than the generals who see this as an opportunity to put this monument here in this area, and there is a better way of doing this, and we can send that message to them now and tell them by doing this, by the way, we are creating this money that can be spent on family housing, that can be spent on training, that can be spent on impact aid for children or some other source. I do not know whether it can be done in this budget, in this particular bill, but it can be spent in other areas, and I urge support for this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends approving this project, which was included in the administration's budget request.

General Sullivan, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Lieutenant General Dominy, the Director of the Army Staff, and the Honorable Joe Reeder, the Under Secretary of the Army have all relayed that this is the Army's No. 1 priority. They strongly believe that:

The United States is the only major Nation that does not have a national Army museum in its Capital.

The essence of the American Army is the citizen-soldier. The museum will serve as a tribute to those people, telling the story of how they lived, served, and died for the Nation throughout our history, and explaining the reasons for their sacrifice and the high cost of armed conflict.

They further point out that:

It is important for the public to understand the role and mission of a military force in a democracy, and the part citizens play both by serving in the military and by monitoring our Armed Forces.

The museum will have a distinct military value, providing archival research for military historians as well as daily support to the Army's leadership.

After a 10-year search and study of over 60 potential sites, the Army has decided on a site within the extended monumental core of Washington, which

will facilitate access for 1 million visitors each year.

Anticipated savings of \$2 million per year will be realized by moving the Center of Military History from leased space into Army-owned space.

The Army's proposal is to acquire this site with appropriated funds, and to build the National Museum of the U.S. Army entirely with donated funds.

It is the committee's view that construction of such a facility with nonappropriated funds is entirely fitting, in recognition of the Army's role in the development of the Nation.

Both the Army and the committee have looked very hard at this land acquisition project, and the Army's best estimate is that it can be accomplished for \$14 million, rather than the \$17 million that was requested. That estimate is the basis for the committee's recommendation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. We are speaking about a tribute, tribute to soldiers. It is that simple. What we need to do is to purchase the land so that donations across our country can build this museum as a tribute to our soldiers.

I was struck by what the gentleman from Virginia said a few moments ago, that we are losing our sense of history. We in this country must regain that sense of history, particularly for the young people, those who come to Washington, those that wish to learn, those that are impressionable, because, if they see what their forefathers, particularly the soldier forefathers, thought the Army's 220-year history has done, has done for freedom, they will have a better understanding of not just the Army, but of our Nation.

We have an obligation to our soldiers. We have an obligation to our veterans, and especially those Americans who lost loved ones in uniform, to show how America's soldiers lived, and served, and died for our Nation throughout the Army's entire history.

We have an obligation as well to ensure that our society and the military do not grow apart. There is a real problem should that happen. In 1950, there were 3.9 soldiers for every 1,000. In 1996, there will be less than 2 soldiers for every 1,000 citizens. We need for Americans, young people and older folks as well, who have no contact with our Nation's Army, to understand the role, and the best place would be in a museum of this sort.

I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me start off by offering my congratulations to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for a remarkable job in presenting a very fair and balanced, and I think effective, piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, one of the more important skills, it seems to me, that any

legislator should possess is the ability to separate emotions from merits, and I would suggest that this amendment is a true test of that skill. I want to assure the Chair and the Members of this body that I have the utmost respect for both the gentleman from Alabama, as well as the gentleman from California. But I would also suggest that on this occasion we differ, because this amendment, while very long on emotion, Mr. Chairman, falls very short on the merits, and I wanted to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] when he said that he respected the Citizens Against Government Waste. I am proud to say that I have earned their taxpayer hero award in the past. I have my little hat that I like to wear on important occasions. But my respect does not cloak them in a gown of infallibility, and indeed on this issue they are dead wrong.

Let me make just a few points about some of the things that we raised in their letter that they circulated this morning. The first, that the Army already has 48 museums, is misleading at best. Most of these facilities are nothing more than a room set aside in some remote facility, some remote post across the United States, same kinds of rooms that are set aside in virtually every branch of the military and cannot, by any reasonable stretch of the imagination, be considered a true museums of the magnitude and scope that is considered here. The second is when they suggest that there is an impropriety or a corporate bailout involved here, and I think that kind of suggestion is simply outrageous. The fact of the matter is that the Army studied this proposal very thoroughly. They considered 60 sites, and it should be noted that this proposal is not just endorsed by the Army. It is, in fact, endorsed by the National Capital Planning Commission. It is endorsed by the Commission on Fine Arts. It is endorsed by the National Park Service, and to my friend from California who stated his concern about local tax base and tax revenues, it is also endorsed by Arlington County, which suggests that perhaps Arlington County residents understand very well the importance of this facility.

Mr. Chairman, the reasoning of this amendment would have us believe that the Secretary of Defense, that the President of the United States, that the Secretary of Army, that the Chief of Staff of the Army, do not care about the welfare of men and women under their command, do not care about the importance of other issues and quality of life.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, that kind of assertion is not just wrong, it is ludicrous, and it is an insult to those good men who have dedicated their lives to the service of this country.

This bill in its inclusion of funds for the National Museum for the U.S. Army is a recognition that we need,

and we certainly deserve that kind of facility, a place where America can go and pay homage and remember the sacrifice that other Americans have made for more than 200 years in the name of liberty and freedom; a place to honor and to ensure that we never forget the glory, we never forget the heroes, but, most importantly, we never forget the sacrifices that are made to obtain and retain democracy.

To reject that need it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, is not an act in service to the U.S. Army. It is rather an insult to every man and woman who has ever worn the uniform.

I have heard here today we should go and ask the men and women in the Army what they believe. I have no doubt in my mind that, if asked, they would think and they would say very clearly, this facility is a place that is necessary and a place of reverence to democracy, and they would endorse it wholeheartedly.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, as one who is a former member of the U.S. Army—

Mr. MCHUGH. I am not, sir.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am. I wanted you to know I strongly support the amendment. You have asked one, I have told you.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would still suggest, in all reverence to the gentleman's service, that I have an Army facility with more than 30,000 people of Army service on it, and I have talked to many of them, and they do support it. It is my belief that that in fact would be almost unanimous across the spectrum. I call for the rejection of this amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Browder amendment.

As a member of the Military Construction Subcommittee I have a deep respect and support for the chair of the subcommittee, Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Along with ranking member HEFNER, Chair VUCANOVICH has brought to the floor a well crafted and very fair bill.

Most importantly, the bill takes a strong stand against the abhorrent living conditions forced upon many military families. The living conditions of our soldiers and their families are a problem that has been ignored by the Department of Defense and the executive branch for decades. It is a problem the Military Construction Subcommittee has historically championed.

When Defense Secretary Perry recently asked to meet with subcommittee members on pressing housing

needs, it was a breath of fresh air. Finally, someone at the Pentagon had woken up to the fact that the housing of our troops is woefully inadequate.

There is a \$3 billion backlog for family housing. The barracks deficit is \$8.5 billion. The Pentagon says the Army's share of the barracks deficit will take 23 years to eliminate.

And then, there are the children of those military families who must live in the housing we provide.

When during subcommittee hearings, I asked the Army what they were doing for the adolescent children of military families. I was informed that, for this year, there will be an \$8.5 million program to provide school aged children and adolescents with activities targeted to prevention of at-risk behaviors.

The Army gave a glowing report of computer centers, and sports programs that were supported by this program.

But there is always a last word.

In this case, the final words were: "However, due to limited resources, the Army is not currently funded to continue these programs in fiscal year 1996 and beyond."

This was, and I repeat was, an \$8.5 million program to help teens deal successfully with the unique problems they face as children of military personnel.

This was a program the Army chose to highlight as a successful, unique program for troubled adolescents. But the Army's limited resources are forcing its closure.

It is within this context that I support the Browder amendment and that I oppose the Army Museum project.

The Department's request for the museum is \$17 million. This request is for land acquisition only—for 7 acres only—that's \$2.4 million an acre. Are these 7 acres plated in gold?

How the Defense Department can with any clear conscience come to Congress and discuss with us the emergency of housing conditions, and at the same time request \$17 million to purchase 7 acres for a museum, is beyond me. There are thousands of locations, where, at a cost more suited to this Nation's budget situation, the Army could put this museum.

It is unfortunate that this project was included in the bill. To Chair VUCANOVICH's credit, the request was limited to \$14 million.

But it should be removed altogether.

Every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States holds great respect and appreciation for our soldiers in the Army. Every soldier makes a deep, personal sacrifice to protect our Nation's freedom. The Army's legacy deserves honor and respect.

There should be a place for all Americans to go and remember, and to discover, the unique role the Army has played in this great Nation's history. But now is not the time for this project.

Maybe at a different time and a less costly location, but now we face a real

housing crisis. This crisis affects those who serve now, today. Programs to help the increasing population of adolescents are being eliminated. These kids are a part of the military family, and they are struggling right now.

I urge my colleagues to support the Browder amendment and dedicate these funds to those serving in the Army today. There will be a time to support this project, but it is not now and it is not at this location.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It was requested by the U.S. Army. It was the Army that said this was one of their top priorities in order to provide a place which pays tribute to the young men and women who have served so valiantly on behalf of this country in an Army uniform throughout the history of this Nation.

They said they wanted this money, and this was with the blessing of the administration. They said they needed \$17 million as a top priority to purchase land which has become available by a willing seller in the National Capital area, land that is within close proximity to this building. They said that they are going to build a museum funded with private dollars, not Federal dollars, but they need the start-up capital to acquire the land on which that museum would be located.

They said they have been conducting a 10-year search, and that they believe very strongly that on the heels of that search, with this land available and with private funds now in the pipeline to build this museum, that they can in fact do what every other service has done, and that is build a National Museum to represent their service—the U.S. Army.

I do not think it is an unusual or unreasonable request. I agree with everything else that the gentleman that just preceded me said. Unfortunately, we do have a situation in which 60 percent of the facilities available to the young people in uniform today are inadequate, and we are addressing those problems. Some of the very same people that will speak in favor of this bill are going to be decrying other portions of the bill, saying we are spending too much money on trying to provide for the young men and women in the service.

Well, that is what we are doing here. We are providing for these people by just giving them a little opportunity to express their pride in the service they have made for the country. Frankly, not all of them gave that service lightly. Some paid with their limbs, some paid with their health, and some paid with their lives, and it seems to me that it is a small token of our appreciation to purchase the land on which the museum can be built with private

funds to thank them for that dedicated service.

So I hope that we will acknowledge that this is not pork-barrel spending. In fact, this committee, the Committee on Appropriations, and this subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada, has worked within their budget caps. We have a bill that conforms to the budget resolution that this Congress adopted just a month ago.

So we are not busting the budget. We are acting in response to what the administration and the Pentagon and the folks in the military uniform wish us to do. I think it is penny wise and pound foolish, as well as pretty mean-spirited, to tell them no, to tell them we are not going to provide land so you can build your museum.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment to strike \$14 million from the Army's construction account, funds currently intended to acquire land that has been sitting for years, for a new Army Museum near the Pentagon.

I believe there are many reasons to oppose the military construction appropriations bill, but I can think of no more glaring example of unnecessary spending than this museum. Even for those who support the appropriations measure, the amendment is a common sense effort to improve the final bill. We in Congress must make every effort possible to eliminate spending for programs, no matter the level of funding, which are not justifiable, in order to be able to both balance our budget and have resources available for investments in our Nation's future.

As a new Member of Congress, I have tried to approach this issue objectively by asking some basic questions about priorities. Should an Army Museum get a higher priority than military housing or other assistance for military personnel and their families, at the same time that dozens of military installations are being slated for base closure, is it prudent to spend funds, funds we do not have, to acquire land for an Army Museum?

How would this museum contribute to military readiness or preparedness? Do we have extra money in our country's bank account, or are we in fact already beyond our ready reserve limit?

My conclusion was that it was time for us to be honest with ourselves. This museum, I do not believe, is about preserving artifacts. If it were, we would be helping the many other Army Museums that are literally falling apart in our country, with important artifacts of our history rotting away in those museums.

What we need here today is to have some common sense. That is what the American people are asking us to have. Let us show real respect for our Army personnel. Let us take care of our ex-

isting facilities in this country before building another new one.

Finally, with our country's deficit in the condition that it is in today, we have no business thinking about a proposal like this. I am surprised that a proposal like this would be in the bill. Let us take a step today toward changing the way Washington operates. Let us vote for this amendment to eliminate a needless spending project.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman for his remarks. I think they are right on target as far as Members of Congress attempting to set priorities and spending patterns of what we are doing up here. Even though the gentleman who is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations spoke earlier that even though it is within 902 allocation, et cetera, and it is their money, so they can spend it any way they want, well, I do not know. I thought we were up here on taxpayers' business. I thought it was the taxpayers who really were supposed to be responsible to, not just to each other. That talk sounded to me like it was just like we were responsible only to each other.

As I look at this as a person who thinks about my taxpayers, I heard one earlier person say this morning arguing for this museum that it is only \$14 million. "Only \$14 million." Well, folks, hey, back home, \$14 million is a whole bunch of money. A whole bunch of money. It is not just "only \$14 million." And then you add to that, it is for 7 acres—\$14 million for 7 acres?

The gentleman from Minnesota, I bet you got a lot of land that your taxpayers would like to sell to the Pentagon at \$2 million an acre, do you not?

Mr. LUTHER. I think I could find some of that land.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think I could find a whole bunch of it in my district. That is completely unheard of, to spend this kind of money, taxpayers' money, at the same time when we look at the total picture, not just military construction, when we look at the total picture, we are going to have complete cut-out of low income energy assistance for your people and my people so they can theoretically buy 7 acres of ground to put a museum on for the U.S. Army. Well, as a former member of the U.S. Army, I want to tell you, my priorities are for my taxpayers and my people, not for a museum that we do not think we need at this time.

□ 1315

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into an agreement with the gentlewoman.

Since we have established earlier that the House was going to try to complete their business by 2, if it is agreeable and we can accommodate everybody, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all

amendments thereto conclude at 15 minutes until 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to agree on that on our side, but I think the time should be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of this amendment.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, the request is for this one amendment and all amendments thereto. I do not know of any substitutes or amendments to this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises that the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], will be recognized for 15 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, if there is going to be a limitation on this amendment and all amendments thereto to end at 1:45 and there are other amendments pending, when will they be considered?

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious we are not going to be able to finish this bill today. I would assume that we would come back next Tuesday and continue the bill. This takes us to the time when the House will adjourn for the week, and we will come back on next week and we will have a vote on this one single amendment and get this amendment out of the way. That is what my request was.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just wanted to make that clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already allocated the time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

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

Mr. Chairman, let me outline again the purpose of this amendment. The purpose of my amendment was not to eliminate the building of this museum in honor of the Army and those who have fought valiantly for our country over the centuries of our Nation's history. That is not the purpose.

The purpose of this amendment was to save \$14 million to allow us to be able to go ahead and construct this

museum. I might mention that the Army has indicated that this would not be done with taxpayers' dollars. It would be done by private donations, but to do so on land that the Federal Government already owns, to do so on land, for example, which is adjacent to it, Fort Myer, of which there is ample property to build a museum, or perhaps at the Pentagon on part of their parking lot where, again, there is ample land to build this museum, both of which are directly adjacent to the proposed site.

Again, during a time when we are looking at the \$200 billion budget deficits, \$14 million is not insignificant, when we can go out and do it with property that already exists, I believe we should do so.

So, again, I would urge the House to vote in favor of this amendment to eliminate this \$14 million expenditure but to do so by building, again, this museum on land that already exists, already is owned by the Federal Government.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

What this is about is that history is important. We have an obligation to continue teaching the lessons of history and remember our military experiences as they have evolved. As our Army becomes smaller, it is more important that we continue that.

This museum will be a recognition of this. To compare this museum with its over 500,000 items and artifacts to the small museums that the Army has scattered across the country is really misleading. The Army museum system today consists of a very disparate collection of localized branch-specific museums. These local collections offer a look at the past from the perspective of their particular area of interest, whether transportation or aviation or logistics, but this museum steps back to look at the experience of the American soldier going back to revolutionary times touched by all aspects of Army life during a long and proud history.

I think we can have a consolidation of some of these smaller museums if this moves ahead. But to get to the money issues that have been addressed, Mr. Chairman, for every dollar in public contribution that will go forward to buying this land, we expect a match of over \$5 from the private and volunteer sector coming in. That is money well spent in this particular case.

At a time when the Army is getting one recruit for over 100 contacts it makes, this will be a good effort to increase the contacts the Army makes to over 200,000 people a year. So I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I also wanted to commend the gentleman from California for offering this amendment in light of all the opposition that appears to come from members of the Committee on Appropriations on military construction, but I think, as I said previously, we all should stop and think of what we are doing here. We are actually spending \$14 million, which is not a small amount of money, for 7 acres of ground, 7 acres.

Now, to me that is a whole bunch, that is \$2 million an acre. I do not know where you have to buy land to get it for \$2 million an acre, but I guarantee you that the gentleman in the chair, the Chairman, has a whole bunch that he would like to sell to the U.S. Army for \$2 million an acre. I have got a whole bunch I would like to sell.

But that is not the bottom line. The bottom line is, we are in a budget-cutting and a cost-cutting mood here and I commend the Congress for that. I believe in a balanced budget, but I also believe we need to establish priorities.

Now, when we go about cutting such things as money for school lunches, when we cut money for senior citizens, when we cut money out of low-income energy assistance, when we cut other programs for other people, then come up and say, now, here is \$14 million that you can pay for 7 acres of ground in order to build a museum on, folks, I think if I go back and ask the people of my district about that, I think I know what the answer is going to be. I really think the answer is going to be, no, we would rather have that money spent on maybe a farm program.

Agriculture is taking a big cut under this budget. I would love to have \$14 million more back in that agriculture budget. I would love to have \$14 million more back in higher education, student loans, grants, I would love to have it there. I think that is more important than \$14 million for 7 acres of ground, when I understand in Arlington County, it is only assessed at \$10 million. Why are we paying \$14 million for 10 million dollars' worth of grounds? The building on it is not any good. We all know that. Anybody that has ever been there knows that it is almost a wasted area.

I just do not understand it, folks. When you establish priorities, I thought that people were more important than things. It appears here the things are going to be more important than people.

It appears that if you listen to all the Members in the debate, that this thing, this museum, and by the way, I am a former member of the U.S. Army, very proud of the fact, but I do not believe that we need to spend our money, this \$14 million at this time on this museum.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. It just bothers me when I see some of these Members who every time they mention the word "war," mention the word "military," or "armed forces," all of a sudden, some of these biggest spenders in the Congress all of a sudden become deficit hawks. That really bothers me.

My good friend from Missouri who just spoke is up here worried about this bill because we are spending too much money. I went over to pull out all of these lists that I carry around with me, because I do not like Members to be inconsistent. I want them to be consistent when they come on the floor. I find my good friend from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] listed as one of the biggest spenders in the Congress. And so all of a sudden, he is a deficit hawk.

Now, so much for credibility. Now, I just want to tell you this, I am looking at this report from the Committee on Appropriations, and nobody has taken them to task more than I have over the years. As I mentioned before, I will be introducing a bill later this afternoon or Monday at the latest with \$840 billion; that is not million, that is not three quarters of a billion, that is \$840 billion in spending cuts.

I wanted all of you people who are worried about this \$14 million to come out here and vote for that bill or even cosponsor it. Then you will show me some guts. In the meantime, looking at this appropriation report, there is \$14 million appropriated. Let me read you what it says. It says, Fort Myer Army museum land acquisition. It does not say anything about a particular piece of property.

I know the gentleman is sponsoring a resolution. He is a true deficit hawk and he means well. But we need to work this out with the Army. If we can find a better place or a cheaper place to do it, fine. The problem is, we want the war museum. We want those people who have died and sacrificed for their country to have their families be able to come here and look at those artifacts.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me mention this. It was mentioned why not build the museum on Fort Belvoir or Fort Myer. It is prohibited to build the museum or any museum on that. That is why we have to do it here.

□ 1330

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me just say that that gentleman is also from Missouri, Mr. Chairman. I have hanging on my wall a picture of one of the great Presidents of this country. His name was Harry S. Truman. I was in the Marine

Corps at the time he was here in Washington. I was proud of him, and I was a Democrat at the time. That is a good Democrat there. He would oppose this amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Harry Truman would never have built this museum.

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, he would, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I wish I could resolve the issue of how Mr. Truman would have voted on this particular proposal. I am not confident of Mr. Truman's vote.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring this body's attention back to the question of how do we balance this budget, and how do we set our priorities as a country. I would like to refer the body to legislation that was passed in 1994. It was the fiscal year 1995 defense authorization report that accompanied that legislation, and was signed by the President. It includes in it a guideline that was developed in the U.S. Senate.

The Senate developed a 5-part test for whether or not military construction projects ought to be approved. The Porkbusters Caucus in the House of Representatives has adopted that test.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read one part of that test: "We should not appropriate money for military construction unless the project is necessary for reasons of the national security of the United States."

Regardless of what our opinion ought to be of museums, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we should not be including in military construction, funds for museum sites and museums. We have the Smithsonian Institution. Certainly it can operate museums in the District and in the neighboring territory. We do not have to include this in our military construction budget, especially when we are trying to care for the needs of the men and women in the Armed Forces, and we have heard about the deplorable conditions in housing and the need for military construction in a variety of other ways.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this Chamber to respect this principle that has been developed and signed into law by the United States, that emphasizes that we only spend money in military construction for reasons of national security.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think we need to remember here what we are talking about is, and the chairman would understand this, Mr. Chairman, being from Nebraska, what we are talking about is planting seed. We are talking about \$14 million here that is the seed to go into the ground, to grow and flourish to become a beautiful plant that we can all be proud of somewhere down the line.

The question is, Do we believe that museums to honor our heritage and our history are important? I happen to

think they are important, so I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone to many of the Army museums around the country that have been mentioned here today. They are little divisional museums of one kind or another, and I am excited about them. I am the kind of guy that can get emotional walking up and down the historic Halls of this building. I go on the battlefield and I can smell the smoke and hear the guns. I love that kind of thing.

Yet, here we have a nation, the only nation in the world, only major nation in the world, that does not have some kind of an Army museum; not a dozen divisional museums, or 40 divisional museums, but a museum for the Army of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I fly in every week, practically, into Washington, DC. When I come into National, many of the Members have had this experience, when I come into National, if I am on the left-hand side of the airplane I look out and I see the wonderful monuments honoring the freedom and liberty and history of this country: The Washington Monument, the Lincoln Monument, Jefferson Memorial, all the way up to the Capitol of the United States.

However, if I am on the right side of the airplane, I see acre after acre of stark white tombstones. What this tells me is what I have on the left-hand side of the airplane was bought with a price from what is on the right-hand side of the airplane. I think that is what the Army museum is all about. It is telling us the price that was paid for this country's freedom and liberty.

I think we ought to honor it. I think we ought to support that museum. It is a small portion of the \$72 million that will be raised privately. It is a partnership between the seed that we put in and the private money which comes. Support the Army museum. Vote against this amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, we are coming down to the vote. Let us lay out here what we have. We could have debated this earlier this week when we were talking about the authorization bill, about this museum and whether we needed to spend this money. I had an amendment which would have sent this money to military family housing. That amendment for some strange reason was not made in order, so this body could not debate it.

What we have now is an opportunity to answer this question in a very simple way: Do we want to spend \$14 million on this project? The Army generals, the Army brass, want this project. They have figured out sticking it in here, running it through with a good package, a good package that both sides have worked on, stick it in, run it through, nobody can stop it.

Mr. Chairman, we have to stop it. We have to decide what we are going to do, send this message to them, tell them to

come back next year and let us debate this issue on this floor, and we will make that decision. I am sure we will make the wise decision. However, right now the wise decision is to support this amendment, and let us debate this at a later time.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I had 2 minutes. I am glad I am getting up now, or I would end up with none.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I would like to say that our country is still a young nation compared to Europe. Do we realize that freedom really does not come easily? What is wrong with honoring freedom by having this museum? Russia is. They are honoring those who kept the German Panzer divisions out of Russia. They are building a wonderful museum that costs three times more than what we are trying to do here today.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that a million Americans will visit this Army museum. Some of them will be young Americans. They will be impressed. They will join the Army. This is a good recruiting tool. Mr. Chairman, let me say that the military is in trouble on recruiting. They are not meeting their goals. Anything that can help the military to get young men and women into the service, that is what we need. Part of this museum will be dedicated to the National Guard and Reserve. I will point out that the National Guard, 29th Division of World War II, landed at Omaha Beach. They lost 2,000 young men from one State fighting at Omaha Beach. That will be shown, what sacrifices have been made by Americans who were in the Army. I totally oppose this amendment, and hope the Members will, too.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of funding for the National Museum of the U.S. Army.

The bill provides \$17 million for land acquisition, but the rest of the cost will come from private donations.

This museum is expected to draw more than 1 million visitors a year to see the great history of our Army and the role it has played in the development, and in the defense, of our country.

One thing I especially like is that it in addition to covering the achievements of active duty Army soldiers since 1775, it will also have a section devoted to the National Guard and Reserves.

I would point out that at the invasion of Normandy 51 years ago this month, the 29th division of National Guardsmen stormed onto Omaha Beach as part of the expeditionary force. They lost 2,000 young men on D-Day.

That event, as well as other stories of bravery and sacrifice over the years, will be on display at the Twin Bridges site. This comprehensive look at the Army, from then until now, will provide future generations of Americans a chance to see the realities of war and the effect it has had not only on the soldiers, but on their loved ones as well.

The Army is the only service branch not to have a national museum. Yet, the U.S. Army is 220 years old—older than the country itself.

This museum will be a deserving tribute to that storied history and worthy recognition to all those who have served in the U.S. Army. It will also help educate the American people about military life, in wartime and in peace. It is a worthy project. I hope we will reject the amendment and keep the funding for the museum.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want the body to know that I rise in support of this amendment. I do so with some very serious sensitivity, because I am getting all kinds of messages from a variety of Members of the House, but I have heard the arguments from the top brass in the Army, how this museum would be a national treasure to commemorate the hard work of every enlisted man and women in the Army.

Therefore, I decided last night to call some of my own folks who happen to be in the military services. Their message was entirely different. I spoke with 6 different soldiers in 4 different Army commands in my district, which is the place where the National Training Center for the Army is located.

I let them know that today we would be considering the military construction bill, legislation which provides funds for military housing, base improvements, and other quality of life needs. I asked them specifically, would they like to have \$14 million of these funds set aside to buy the land for a National Museum for the Army in their honor in Washington.

Each and every one of the 6 of them said they would rather have those funds go to housing or other quality of life items which they desperately need. I told each and every one of them that there was a large amount of additional funding already in the bill for housing. Our chairman has done a great job. It did not matter to any of them. A national museum in their honor was not on their priority list.

I told one soldier that this was a priority to the Army Command in Washington. He responded "That is because they do not have to live in the housing that we do." He told me that he has men living in temporary barracks that were constructed during World War II. His room is 11 by 12 feet in space, with temporary walls, and one of the bigger rooms. He also said that he has men and women driving 40 miles to work every day because there is not adequate housing.

Mr. Chairman, to say the least, while I have mixed emotions about this, this is not a priority to the men and women who are currently in the Army in my district in California.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time. I really re-

gret I do not have enough time to say nearly everything I want to say.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I absolutely, absolutely oppose this amendment. I regret that the amendment is even on the floor. We resoundly defeated this amendment in our subcommittee in the Committee on National Security earlier. In fact, to me it represents a great disdain for the heritage of those who have served the U.S. Army. We are not fighting the issue of quality of life.

This bill added \$813 million extra for housing. We are dealing with the quality of life issue. However, Mr. Chairman, my experience is not in the Army, it is in the U.S. Air Force. Whenever the Nation called me, I went. I left my family and I placed myself in jeopardy in defense of my Nation, and guess what? My Army colleagues have done that for 220 years. In fact, 470,246 members of the United States Army have died on the battlefield. Is it too much to ask for us to put a lousy \$14 million in honor of those who have fallen? It is less than \$20 a head.

Mr. Chairman, we would be making a giant mistake if we did not shut down this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am reminded that we are told that one does not live on bread alone. Soldiers do not accomplish their mission on food and forage alone. There is something called spirit and something called morale. My only regret is that this country has not provided the initiative to go forward with a museum honoring the soldiers of this U.S. Army much earlier.

The time has come, Mr. Chairman, We should not accept this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. There is an old adage in the infantry that battles are won and wars are won on things other than money. If this amendment is adopted, we will not put one more nickel into housing, recreation, or anything else. But if this amendment is rejected, the U.S. Army is going to have something that will help all of us who served in previous wars.

Point to what it is that the Army has done. The Army is the only service that has no museum of this kind, and this is the only country of which I am aware of where no such museum exists to remind our veterans and our people of what it is that was done. Veterans say "We would like to you to remember what we did, and we would like you to remember why we did it." A museum will help Americans to understand that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be rejected. Remember, wars are won by morale. Service is enhanced by morale. Look at the British Army. They are all manner of curious troops, and they all serve enthusiastically. Why? Because of loyalty to their service.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the main point of this amendment has been missed. I find it quite ironic that I find myself in virtual complete agreement with those who are speaking against this amendment. I also favor the museum. I also favor our military. I favor us honoring those who have fought bravely for our military and for our country.

□ 1345

That is not the purpose of this amendment. The purpose is, why should we as taxpayers be spending an additional \$14 million to purchase more land to build a museum on when we have land already available? Are we not closing down several departments? Are we not downsizing here in Washington?

Do we not have Pentagon property, Fort Myer property, adjacent to this property that the Federal Government and the taxpayers already own? Do we have to go out and buy more property? Do we have to go out and spend, I feel unwisely, more taxpayer dollars?

That is the issue. Again, I support the museum, but I support it being built on presently owned taxpayer property which is in the same area.

I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

(Mr. MYERS of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I regret that we have run out of time, but I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

I have served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for 25 years. I have offered and supported many amendments to reduce spending. I will take a back seat to no one on cutting and reducing unnecessary spending. I spent 23 years in Army service.

There is a time when we must act. There are those today who believe that the Army does not need and should not have a national museum. The oldest service of the uniformed services should have. We should have taken action to build a museum years ago.

If you believe, as I do, that we should have a museum, then we must act now or the site will be lost to a commercial use, and we will build it sometime at an even greater cost here in our Nation's Capital, or build it in a cornfield someplace where few will ever have the opportunity to enjoy it.

We are all concerned with quality of life for the young people we are asking to serve in defense of freedom. Pride and esprit de corps are also important to these people of whom we are so proud.

Defeat this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. As I travel toward the District, more Hispanics have received the Congressional Medal of Honor than any other ethnic group. They would like to be included in this museum so that they can display their history of bravery. At this moment I have to oppose my good friend and oppose his amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, sometimes we focus so much on the cost of things, no matter how small, that we lose sight of the value of things, no matter how great.

The National Museum of the U.S. Army is a vision to create at the gateway of Washington, a site that will no longer remain if we don't act now, a tribute to the American soldier. At a time when our Armed Forces are being cut every year, we have to tell the story of the citizen soldiers that have served this Nation, and we must inspire patriotism among our entire society.

That is the purpose of this. That is the purpose. There could be no greater purpose. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and to support the bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

I know a little bit about this subject since the land to be acquired for the purposes of building a national Army museum was originally part of the planned land swap for a portion of Fort Sheridan in my district. Several years ago the Army wished to trade the Fort Sheridan land, plus cash, for the property in Arlington then, and perhaps still, owned by Equitable. While that trade was blocked in the Senate, it was clear that this was a priority for the Army and one that I thought then, and still do now, deserved our support.

A nation's history is contained in its institutions. As a former Army enlisted man, I know the meaning of the traditions and history of the Army to those who don the uniform. The Army has never had a proper place to house and display its history and this land is deemed a very suitable site. There is no money in the bill for construction and that would come only when budgetary times are more propitious.

But if the land cannot be acquired now, it would undoubtedly be sold to others and developed and would be lost for the purpose of an Army museum. While the price may seem high, we thought, from the value of the Fort Sheridan land, that it would likely be even higher than the sum contained in the bill. We should reject the gentlemen's amendment and allow this land acquisition to go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 137, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—261

Allard	Franks (NJ)	Myrick
Andrews	Frelinghuysen	Nadler
Archer	Frisa	Neal
Army	Funderburk	Nethercutt
Bachus	Furse	Neumann
Baesler	Ganske	Ney
Baker (CA)	Gilchrest	Norwood
Baldacci	Gillmor	Nussle
Barcia	Goodling	Obey
Barr	Gordon	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Goss	Orton
Barton	Graham	Owens
Bass	Greenwood	Paxon
Becerra	Gunderson	Payne (NJ)
Berman	Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)
Billbray	Hall (OH)	Petri
Blute	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Bono	Hamilton	Pomeroy
Brewster	Hansen	Portman
Browder	Harman	Poshard
Brown (OH)	Hastings (WA)	Pryce
Brownback	Hayworth	Quinn
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Radanovich
Bunn	Heger	Rahall
Bunning	Hilleary	Ramstad
Burr	Hilliard	Rangel
Burton	Hobson	Regula
Calvert	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Camp	Hoke	Richardson
Canady	Horn	Riggs
Cardin	Hostettler	Rivers
Castle	Houghton	Roberts
Chabot	Hutchinson	Roemer
Chenoweth	Inglis	Rogers
Christensen	Istook	Rohrabacher
Chryslers	Jackson-Lee	Roth
Clement	Jacobs	Roukema
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Coburn	Johnson (SD)	Royce
Combest	Jones	Rush
Condit	Kanjorski	Sabo
Conyers	Kaptur	Salmon
Cooley	Kasich	Sanders
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Sanford
Crapo	Kennelly	Sawyer
Creameans	Kildee	Scarborough
Cunningham	Kim	Schiff
Danner	Klug	Schroeder
Deal	Knollenberg	Schumer
DeFazio	LaFalce	Seastrand
DeLauro	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Dellums	Largent	Shadegg
Deutsch	Lazio	Shaw
Dicks	Leach	Shays
Dixon	Levin	Shuster
Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter
Doolittle	Lincoln	Smith (MI)
Dreier	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Dunn	Lofgren	Souder
Durbin	Longley	Stark
Ehlers	Luther	Stearns
Ehrlich	Maloney	Stenholm
Engel	Manzullo	Stockman
English	Markey	Studds
Ensign	Martinez	Stupak
Eshoo	Martini	Talent
Evans	McCarthy	Tate
Ewing	McCollum	Tauzin
Fattah	McCrery	Thomas
Fawell	McDermott	Thompson
Fields (LA)	McInnis	Thornberry
Fields (TX)	McIntosh	Thurman
Filner	McKeon	Tiahrt
Flake	McKinney	Torricelli
Flanagan	Meehan	Towns
Foley	Menendez	Upton
Forbes	Metcalf	Velazquez
Ford	Meyers	Vento
Fowler	Mfume	Visclosky
Fox	Minge	Volkmer
Frank (MA)	Mink	Waldholtz
Franks (CT)	Moorhead	Walker

Wamp
Watt (NC)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

White
Whitfield
Williams
Wise

Woolsey
Wyden
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—137

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bartlett	Green	Packard
Bateman	Gutierrez	Pallone
Beilenson	Hancock	Parker
Bentsen	Hastert	Pastor
Bereuter	Hefley	Payne (VA)
Bevill	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Bishop	Hinchesy	Pickett
Bliley	Holden	Porter
Boehlert	Hoyer	Quillen
Boehner	Hunter	Reed
Bonilla	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonior	Johnson, E. B.	Saxton
Borski	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Boucher	Kelly	Scott
Brown (FL)	Kennedy (RI)	Serrano
Bryant (TX)	King	Sisisky
Callahan	Kingston	Skaggs
Chambliss	Klink	Skeen
Clinger	Kolbe	Skelton
Coleman	Lantos	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Latham	Solomon
Collins (MI)	LaTourette	Spence
Cramer	Laughlin	Spratt
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Stump
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Tanner
Davis	Lightfoot	Taylor (MS)
de la Garza	Linder	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Livingston	Tejeda
Diaz-Balart	Lowey	Torkildsen
Dingell	Lucas	Torres
Dornan	Manton	Trafficant
Doyle	Mascara	Vucanovich
Edwards	McDade	Walsh
Emerson	McHale	Ward
Everett	McHugh	Waters
Farr	McNulty	Watts (OK)
Fazio	Molinari	Waxman
Foglietta	Mollohan	Wicker
Frost	Montgomery	Wilson
Gejdenson	Moran	Wolf
Gekas	Morella	Wynn
Geren	Murtha	Young (AK)
Gibbons	Myers	Young (FL)
Gilman	Oberstar	

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman	Coyne	Mica
Baker (LA)	Dickey	Miller (CA)
Ballenger	Dooley	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Gallegly	Mineta
Brown (CA)	Gephardt	Moakley
Buyer	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Chapman	Hayes	Rose
Clay	Jefferson	Stokes
Clayton	Johnston	Thornton
Clyburn	Kleczka	Tucker
Collins (IL)	Matsui	Weldon (FL)
Cox	Meek	Yates

□ 1411

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Ballenger, with Mr. Mineta against.

Messrs. CLINGER, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and WYNN, and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BRYANT of Tennessee, KANJORSKI, COMBEST, FRISA, THOMAS, RICHARDSON, EHLERS, RANGEL, STOCKMAN, FORD, FORBES, WALKER, NADLER, BURTON of Indiana FOLEY, DREIER, and BAKER of California changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment are agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT

of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1817, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable absence, I missed the following votes, and had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 381, "aye"; rollcall vote 382, "aye"; rollcall 383, "aye"; and rollcall vote 384, "aye".

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to request of the majority leader information about next week's schedule.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], if he would be willing to inform the Members about what we have to look forward to.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House will meet in pro forma session on Monday, June 19. There will be no recorded votes on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 o'clock a.m. for morning hour and 10 o'clock a.m. for legislative business.

After 1-minute, we plan to take up the rule for H.R. 1854, the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill.

If a recorded vote is ordered on the rule, that vote will be postponed until later in the day.

□ 1415

After debate on the legislative branch rule we will take up House Resolution 168, legislation implementing Corrections Day procedures for the House. Upon completion of this legislation we will hold the recorded vote on the rule accompanying the legislative branch appropriations bill, if a vote was ordered. We then plan to finish H.R. 1817, the fiscal year 1996 military

construction appropriations bill and begin debate on the legislative branch appropriations bill. Members should be advised that recorded votes may come as early as 12 noon on Tuesday.

On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider two appropriations bills: H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill, subject to a rule; and the fiscal year 1996 energy and water appropriations bill, subject to a rule.

It is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and their districts by no later than 6 p.m. on Thursday. There will be no recorded votes on Friday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. If the gentleman could help us on a matter relating to the Committee on Rules, I understand the Committee on Rules will be meeting on Monday to prepare to bring to the floor on Tuesday some of the rules that the gentleman has alluded to. I am wondering if we could determine what time the Committee on Rules will be meeting. I am one concerned. I will be flying back from California Fathers' Day, Sunday, and I have an interest in the legislative branch bill, of course, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, if I may make a comment, in the original schedule for the month, Monday was to have been a day on which we would have had votes. Because of so many considerations, we did manage to relieve all of the Members at large of votes on Monday, but the Committee on Rules must necessarily meet at 2 o'clock on Monday, and I appreciate that it is an inconvenience in the gentleman's personal life, but hopefully it will be helpful to the rest of the Members we were able to do that.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am hopeful I will be able to get here by 3:30 or 4, the first plane out. Do you expect the Committee on Rules to have completed its work and filed its rules by 4 o'clock? I do not know what the urgency is, but I gather there is some. Is that right?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the Committee on Rules hopes to file by 6 but they would expect to conclude testimony before the committee by about 4:30.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I may be able to get here just for the latter part of that testimony, and I appreciate my friend with his assistance from the standpoint of the staff of the committee.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I would hope the majority leader might be able to give us some indication whether the privileged resolution that was rumored to be taken up this afternoon concerning waivers of the number of committees that a Member is permitted to serve on

was going to be brought to the floor. We understand it is not being brought to the floor today. My question is: Do we anticipate a resolution will be brought up next week? If that is the case, can the leader assure us that we will have some opportunity to debate that issue? It is a major concern to many of us, the reforms of the House, as to how many committees a Member can serve on.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we believe it is possible we may bring that up next week, and, of course, it is subject to an hour for debate in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. CARDIN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate that. I would ask the leader if he would consider giving us some notice before that is brought to the floor and yield the customary time to the opponent of that type of a resolution in order that we can have a full debate on the floor of the House.

Mr. ARMEY. We will, of course, do our best to give you good notice, and we will, of course, examine the time constraints and certainly take your request under consideration.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WARD. If I might ask the gentleman from Texas, in looking at next week's schedule, I wonder if you would expect to bring up the billionaire expatriate tax loophole bill.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for your inquiry.

No, I do not anticipate that coming up next week. I have not talked to the Committee on Ways and Means yet, and I do not have any time scheduled for that at this point.

Mr. WARD. Well, if I might ask further, do you think that you could give us notice? I have many constituents who are interested in this bill, many constituents of other Members who have inquired, and if I could ask and seek the leader's help in getting some advance notice so we may know when to anticipate that bill.

Mr. ARMEY. Again, if the gentleman would yield further, we would certainly give you as much advance notice as you may need. You may want to go to the Committee on Rules, any number of things. I have not begun consideration of that bill yet from the Committee on Ways and Means, but certainly will give you every bit of notice we can.

Mr. WARD. I thank the gentleman. Mr. FAZIO of California. Could the gentleman tell us when we would be completing our business on Tuesday and Wednesday?

Mr. ARMEY. Each night next week at this point we anticipate being able to be out of here by 6 or 6:30.

Mr. FAZIO of California. No evening next week would normally be expected to be here later?

Mr. ARMEY. If I may tell the gentleman, I have great expectations and

an enormous amount of optimism, but as you might guess, I can give no hard and fast guarantees. If I had a dinner date for Tuesday night at 6:30, I would feel very comfortable with it.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate the gentleman's optimism. Let us hope it becomes reality.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 19, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

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

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, DC, June 15, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my Committee has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, let me cry out: "Shame on you the government of France. * * *

Mr. Speaker, 27 million people in the Pacific cry out: "Shame on you the government of France * * * for your arrogance to explode eight nuclear bombs in the South Pacific starting this September."

Mr. Speaker, the 178 countries who signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty cry out: "Shame on you France * * *"

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to President Jacques Chirac, if he wants to develop France's nuclear bomb trigger device for computer simulation technology, then develop it on a computer—not in the South Pacific, not on people and not on mother Earth. Explode your eight nuclear bombs in Paris and along the rural and farm areas of France, and see if the citizens of France will support you.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of France currently has:

The world's third largest stockpile of nuclear bombs;

The fourth largest navy in the world; and

Twenty years of experience in conducting nuclear bomb explosions in the atmosphere and under water in the South Pacific. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about the trigger device that the French Government wants to develop for its nuclear bomb explosions. The nuclear trigger is a nuclear bomb itself and is 100 times more powerful than the nuclear bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. If the nuclear bomb trigger is 100 times more powerful than what was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the nuclear explosion that will come after that? What madness, Mr. Speaker.

Why not drop your eight nuclear bombs under the Arc de Triomphe—a prided possession for the people of France, because, the island nations of the South Pacific are the prided possessions of the 27 million people who live, eat, drink, and swim in that part of the world.

I say to the military establishment of France and to the President of France—in the words of Bernard Clavel, the popular novelist, "You are the shame of France * * * you are the shame of France."

Mr. Speaker, I include the following newspaper articles for the RECORD:

[From the Samoa News, June 15, 1995]

SOUTH PACIFIC CONDEMNS DECISION TO RESUME NUCLEAR TESTING

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA.—Countries of the South Pacific today sharply condemned France's decision to resume nuclear weapons testing in the region in September.

New Zealand Foreign Minister Don McKinnon bitterly accused French President Jacques Chirac of "Napoleonic-De Gaulle arrogance."

An angry Prime Minister Jim Bolger complained that France had directly insulted his country which sent troops to fight two world wars on French soil. "New Zealanders left the South Pacific to defend France and to help France reclaim its land," Bolger said in a vitriolic attack in Parliament. "Is that our thanks—the fingers sign because the French military want bigger playthings?"

Bolger said France and New Zealand had been "friends for generations and in one act today France decided to hell with the friendship." "It is not too late for France to reconsider its position. There is a great deal at stake," Bolger said. Both Australia and New

Zealand said they will downscale or freeze defense links with France in protest.

Japan's Foreign Minister Yohei Kono also criticized the French decision to resume testing, saying it violates the trust of the non-nuclear community. Kono expressed his disapproval in a telephone call to his French counterpart.

The Philippines and Indonesia joined other Asia-Pacific critics of France's decision.

[From the New York Times, June 15, 1995]

France Planning Nuclear Tests Despite Opposition, Chirac Says

(By Craig R. Whitney)

PARIS, June 13.—President Jacques Chirac of France, defying international opposition to resumption of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific, said tonight that France would resume underground weapons tests in September but would stop them once and for all by the end of May 1996.

Mr. Chirac's predecessor, François Mitterrand, declared a moratorium on nuclear tests in April 1992.

"Unfortunately, we stopped a little too early," Mr. Chirac said, on the eve of a trip to Washington and New York to confer with President Clinton and Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali of the United Nations.

In a news conference in Élysée Palace, Mr. Chirac described his decision as "irrevocable." He said the eight planned tests would have "no ecological consequences" and would complete a series, interrupted three years ago, intended to calibrate equipment that would allow computer simulations in future tests of the reliability of the French independent nuclear deterrent.

Mr. Chirac had been telegraphing his decision for some time, but it could influence the debate in the United States. Some military experts in Washington would like the Clinton Administration to make a few more tests before a permanent ban in a treaty that France, the United States and other countries have pledged to sign next year.

Adm. Jacques Lanxade, the French armed forces chief of staff, reported to Mr. Mitterrand a year ago that the military needed to make a few more tests to insure the reliability of France's nuclear deterrent, according to Defense Minister Charles Millon. But Mr. Mitterrand declined to lift the moratorium.

Mr. Chirac, a conservative who succeeded Mr. Mitterrand on May 7, denounced Mr. Mitterrand's action in 1992 as "a unilateral disarmament decision."

France's independent nuclear deterrent, largely submarine-based, has been the keystone of its independent national defense strategy since the early 1960's, when Gen. Charles de Gaulle decided that dependence on the United States nuclear deterrent was unacceptable.

CONGRATULATING NAVAL ACADEMY CLASS OF 1995

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Naval Academy Board of Visitors and a Member of Congress who has three of the greatest Naval installations in the country in my congressional district—the Patuxent Naval Air Station, the Indian Head Naval Surface Warfare Center, and the Naval Research Laboratory—I was extremely honored to join this year's graduation exercises at the U.S. Naval Academy.

Last year President Clinton in speaking to the graduates said that "I came here today because I want America to know there remains no finer Navy in the world than the U.S. Navy, and no finer training ground for naval leadership than the U.S. Naval Academy."

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the words of our commander in chief.

This year, the graduation speaker was Secretary of the Navy John Dalton, who spoke of the timeless traits of leadership, traits I believe as Members of this body and as a nation we should practice in our everyday lives. I would like to submit the address by Secretary Dalton for the RECORD and close with one of his quotes to the outstanding graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy's Class of 1995:

This institution is unique because its mission is to ensure that in your hearts you are unique. . . . That foremost and everywhere the defense of American liberty will remain your task . . . whether in the Naval service or elsewhere.

My congratulations to the graduates of the class of 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I include Secretary Dalton's address for the RECORD:

TIMELESS TRAITS OF LEADERSHIP

(By Secretary of the Navy, John H. Dalton)

Thank you, Chuck [Admiral Larson]. I want to congratulate you on the outstanding job you have done here at the Academy. One of the decisions I am most proud of was my decision to make Admiral Chuck Larson Superintendent of the Naval Academy. He has stepped in and demonstrated once again his extraordinary leadership ability. I thank you, the Academy thanks you, the Naval Service thanks you, and, above all, America thanks you for producing such outstanding young officers as we have graduating here today.

I am very pleased today to have two people—who are very special to me—here with us. . . . First of all, my claim to fame—the first lady of the Navy, my wife, Margaret . . . and sitting with her is a young man who graduated with honors last year from Davidson College and taught for a year at a Peace Corps-related service in Jamaica—teaching kids in the third world . . . and who is going to be entering Officer Candidate School this August to become a Naval Officer of the United States Navy: my son John.

We are also very pleased to have with us today an outstanding Member of Congress, who has been a strong support and friend of the naval service, Congressman Steny Hoyer.

I have a letter I would like to read to you from our Commander-in-Chief. He wanted to be here today, but was called to that other Academy out in Colorado. I took the first prize and came here. The letter reads:

Congratulations to the class of 1995 as you complete your studies at the United States Naval Academy. You can take great pride in the skills and character you have developed, knowing that you are well prepared to meet the tremendous challenge of leadership. Through the past 150 years, more than 60 thousand Naval Academy men and women have helped to keep our nation great.

Today, America looks to you to maintain this tradition of excellence. I am confident that you will be equal to the task. As you establish new standards of able performance and lead the Naval and Marine Corps into the 21st Century, you will stand as a beacon of liberty and democracy for nations around

the world. On behalf of all Americans, thank you for your dedication to the idea of freedom and your commitment for defending the Constitution of the United States. Best wishes to each of you for every future success. Signed, Bill Clinton

It is simply not possible to describe what a great honor and privilege it is for me to be the principal speaker at the sesquicentennial graduation ceremony of this great institution that I love. I'm proud to be a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, and I know how proud and excited you are today because I remember so well how I felt as I sat where you now sit on graduation day in 1964. The speaker was Congressman Carl Vinson, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Due to the day's excitement, I remember very little of what he said.

Three decades from now, you probably won't remember much of what I say either. But, I hope that you get the main point. Actually, in preparation for this speech I went back to review Carl Vinson's text. He said, "during your Navy careers there not only will continue to be Secretaries of the Navy, but these Secretaries will also continue to shoulder heavy responsibilities." Those words did not have any significance to me at that time. They certainly do now! Paul Nitze was Secretary of the Navy then and handed me my diploma as I will have the honor to present yours to you today.

At graduation last year President Clinton said, "I came here today because I want America to know there remains no finer Navy in the world than the United States Navy, and no finer training ground for naval leadership than the United States Naval Academy." I could not agree more. Today, I want to talk to you about naval leadership and my experience here as a midshipman.

When I was a sophomore at Byrd High School in Shreveport, Louisiana, we had a guest speaker who said that in his opinion the finest overall education that anyone could get in our country was at the United States Naval Academy. My mother always taught me to "hitch my wagon to a star," so I decided right then the Academy was where I wanted to go. That was the only place I applied, but in the spring of my senior year, I learned that I had not been accepted. I was devastated! So, I went to LSU for a year, which I enjoyed, but my heart was still set on the Naval Academy. The next year I was admitted into the Class of 1964.

I got off to a rocky start as a plebe and continued to have some painful and humbling experiences. I wanted to row crew, but got cut plebe summer. The first time they published an unsat list for academics my name was on it. I wanted to fly, but my eyes deteriorated. I competed for a Rhodes Scholarship and was not selected.

But, I also had many great and memorable experiences here. I marched with the whole brigade in John F. Kennedy's inaugural parade. Sadly, I later led a special honor company that marched in his funeral procession to Arlington National Cemetery. I spent first class summer on a foreign exchange cruise with Her Majesty's Royal Navy in Singapore. I had the privilege to serve as a striper in one of the truly great classes ever to graduate from here. For four years in a row, we "beat Army" in football . . . and I am confident that come the first Saturday in December, we are going to start that habit one more time!

The greatest lesson I learned came from our Superintendent, Rear Admiral Charles C. Kirkpatrick. He repeatedly told us, "You can do anything you set your mind to do, and don't you forget it." I pass that on to you. You can do anything you set your mind to do, and don't you forget it.

I know that right now your minds are on the end of your long voyage here . . . and

the pride and joy you feel in what you have accomplished. Your family and friends share that pride and so do I. But along with the celebration, this is also a moment for each of you to think seriously about the challenges you will face in the future.

As you move forward in life, the one thing you will always need is a framework on which to base your approach to leadership. I have given much thought over the years to my own framework. It helped me with the leadership challenges I faced—as a midshipman, an active duty submarine officer, a Naval reservist, a community leader, and government official.

Recently an acquaintance of mine, a theologian from California, sent me a list of eight specific leadership traits that he drew from chapter 27 of the book of Acts in the Bible. In a succinct way, he has caught traits essential to my leadership framework. Now I'm not a preacher and this is not a sermon. But you certainly don't have to be a religious person to appreciate the value of these traits, and you don't have to be a Biblical scholar to interpret them.

These traits have stood the test of time. The list is as follows: A leader is trusted, a leader takes the initiative, a leader uses good judgment, a leader speaks with authority, a leader strengthens others, is optimistic and enthusiastic, never compromises absolutes, and leads by example.

This list can be exemplified by predecessors of yours from this Academy who have captured the essence of these leadership traits.

The first trait is trust. I am told by Admiral Larson that your class admires President Jimmy Carter, Class of 1947, and so do I. He personifies trust. He was successful with the Camp David Accords and the Middle East Peace Treaty, and he continues to serve the cause of peace in the world, because he is so honest and straightforward that he is genuinely trusted.

As plebes, you memorized a great example of trust. At the Battle of Manila Bay, Admiral George Dewey (Class of 1859) turned to the captain of his flagship and said, "You may fire when ready, Gridley." This Academy teaches trust and Admiral Dewey trusted each captain and crew to fight without need for his personal direction.

A leader takes the initiative. "Carpe Diem" Latin for "seize the day" has always been a fundamental tenet of leadership.

I find inspiration in this regard in the deeds of Vice Admiral Jim Stockdale, a classmate of President Carter, who took command of his fellow Prisoners of War in Hanoi at the height of the Vietnam conflict. Admiral Stockdale initiated and led cohesive resistance to torture and abuse despite the daily uncertainty of his own fate.

Good judgment is also critical to good leadership. Good judgment is not just evident in success, it can be most evident in defeat and disappointment.

In the Battle of the Coral Sea, the carrier USS *Lexington*—one of our few assets following Pearl Harbor—took multiple hits that caused her to list and burn. Rear Admiral Aubrey Fitch (Class of 1906), commander of the carrier group—and later a Superintendent of the Naval Academy—calmly assessed damage control efforts. He then turned to the *Lexington's* captain and said, "It's time to get the men off this thing." Twenty-seven hundred lives were saved by that one judgment call. A good leader needs to make tough decisions especially when things are going wrong.

The next trait is at the heart of a leader's personality. A leader speaks with authority. A leader needs to have sufficient confidence in what he is saying so that potential followers will be convinced. The best way to

convince people is to speak with authority. And if that authority is matched by knowledge then the chances for leadership are greatly enhanced.

The development of the concept of amphibious warfare was initiated by Marine Corps Commandants who combined authority with conviction and knowledge. From its origins during the tenures of Commandants John Lejeune, Wendell Neville, and Benjamin Fuller, through the establishment of the Fleet Marine Force under General John H. Russell, all Naval Academy graduates, the development of the Marine Corps as America's expeditionary force was the result of leadership. It was backed by the experience of campaigns in the Caribbean, Central America, the Pacific and China. These leaders spoke with authority in directing new ideas because they had experienced the old ideas and borne the scars.

Likewise, when Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Arleigh Burke (Class of 1923) began the project to build the first fleet ballistic missile submarine, he needed to convince both the civilian leadership and the Navy itself that the program required top priority. The authority of his presentation was fortified with his combat experience—and his reflections about the deterrence implications of that experience.

A leader strengthens others. A good leader does not seek to impose his or her own attitudes or solutions on others. Rather, the leader provides the support and guidance that prompts others to have confidence in their own abilities and decision-making.

When Fleet Admiral Chester Nimitz (Class of 1905) arrived to take command of the remnants of the Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, his first effort was to renew the confidence of the staff and the commanding officers that they could go on to victory. Rather than making heads roll, he made them think. Rather than emphasizing the mistakes, he convinced his subordinates that they were the ones to overcome the past. Those who served under him recalled that his very "presence" seemed to give confidence wherever he was. He strengthened others to believe their abilities could achieve the crucial victory that they sought.

A leader remains optimistic and enthusiastic. To lead effectively, see the glass as half-full, not half-empty. Believe, every morning, that things are going to be better than before. Attitudes are infectious. Optimism and enthusiasm overcome the greatest challenges.

Captain John Paul Jones captured this idea with the immortal quote, "I have not yet begun to fight." I have a painting of that famous battle between the Bonhomme Richard and Serapis hanging in my office and it inspires me every day. John Paul Jones's spirit of optimism and enthusiasm has been a part of our Navy since the American Revolution.

A leader never compromises absolutes. Defense of American freedom and obedience to the Constitution of the United States are two absolutes the Naval Service lives by, and for which our Sailors and Marines may face death.

Admiral Hyman Rickover (Class of 1922), the father of the nuclear Navy—by whom I was interviewed for the Navy's nuclear program—vividly demonstrated this commitment to absolutes. He wanted to ensure there was no compromise in the safety of our submarines. And he did this by setting an example. Most Americans don't know that Admiral Rickover went on the first trial dive of every nuclear submarine the Navy built. He knew that it wasn't enough to simply certify on paper that a new submarine was safe. If Sailors were going to trust their lives to an untested submarine, he would go with them.

If something seemed like it was going wrong during the dive, he would calmly go to the compartment where the problem appeared and sit to watch the crew handle it. How could you be afraid when this small, wrinkled old man was not? How could you treat safety as anything but an absolute.

This leads to the final quality on this list of traits: example. The best leaders need fewer words than most, because they lead with their lives. In the sports world, example is not just ability, but both the willingness to lead and the humility to support a team effort that is stronger than one skilled individual. Roger Staubach class of '65 and David Robinson class of '87 are competitors who set the example as both leaders and teammates.

Among today's Naval leaders, Rear Admiral Anthony Watson, class of 1970, has set an example that many young Americans have decided to follow. Raised in a public housing project in Chicago, he was a recognized leader in every position from midshipman to Commanding Officer to Deputy Commandant here, and became the first African-American submariner to make flag rank. He takes over soon as Commander of the Navy Recruiting Command, a position that demands a very public example.

And finally, I want to mention an academy graduate who exemplifies the fact that women in the Navy and Marine Corps no longer face any limits to their dreams. Since the age of ten, LCDR Wendy Lawrence, class of 1981, dreamed of becoming an astronaut. Three years ago she fulfilled that childhood dream. She became the first female naval aviator chosen by NASA for the astronaut program and was a mission specialist on the shuttle Endeavour's last mission. LCDR Lawrence demonstrates that what matters to the Naval service, above all else, is your performance as an officer. Man or woman, you will rise as high as your abilities will take you.

These eight traits of leadership provide a path, a course that has been marked for almost two thousand years.

There is a long line of Naval heroes before you . . . men and women tried by history. Your turn has come. That's what you were trained for. That is why the Naval Academy has existed for 150 years. Not just to educate . . . not just to train you in the arts of war . . . not just to provide competent officers. But to instill you with a commitment and tradition of service and leadership that will remain with you forever.

In character and in deed, you will always be the ones to set the example. This institutional is unique because its mission is to ensure that in your hearts you are unique . . . that foremost and everywhere the defense of American liberty will remain your task . . . whether in the Naval Service or elsewhere. Those people behind you are counting on you. When you shake hands with me as you receive your diploma, let's regard it as a pact—a bond between two graduates of this extraordinary institution—to be as worthy as we can possibly be of those who have gone before us . . . of those who march with us today . . . and of those who will follow us. In a few moments, your diploma and our handshake will seal that bond. And then the real challenge will begin.

God bless you. God bless the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps. And God bless America.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHLERS addressed the House. HIS remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IN OPPOSITION TO FRANCE'S RESUMPTION OF NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as a Member from the Pacific Islands, I rise again in strong protest of France's decision to resume detonating nuclear bombs in the South Pacific on French Polynesia's Moruroa Atoll.

French President Jacques Chirac claims that the eight atomic bomb explosions planned—about one a month between this September and next May—are completely safe to the environment. I am not persuaded.

The people of the Pacific know from firsthand experience the horrors associated with nuclear bomb explosions and testing. As an American, I am not proud of the legacy of the United States testing program of the 1940's, the 1950's, and the 1960's on Bikini and Rongelap Atolls in the Marshall Islands. Even now, a half-century later, that bitter legacy is still being felt in the Marshall Islands.

In particular, I have long believed that when the United States detonated the "Bravo Shot" on Bikini Atoll—a 15-megaton thermonuclear bomb, a 1,000 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb—the Marshall Islanders residing on nearby Rongelap and Utirik Atolls were deemed expendable. These Pacific islanders justifiably believe they were used as "guinea pigs" and test subjects for nuclear radiation experiments conducted by our Nation. People there have not forgotten memories of the offspring of Pacific islander women infected by radiation from the nuclear explosions—where babies were born dead and didn't look human and were sometimes called "jelly babies."

Although our country, decades ago, stopped its nuclear testing in the Pacific, our Nation is still mired in the process of facing responsibility and making financial reparations for the devastating impact that our nuclear bomb explosions had on the Pacific people of the Marshall Islands.

France has detonated over 200 nuclear bombs already, with almost all of those nuclear explosions taking place

in the South Pacific. After sustaining the incomprehensible destructive energy unleashed by these bombs, French Polynesia's Moruroa Atoll has been described by scientific researchers as a "Swiss cheese of fractured rock." Leakage of radioactive waste from the underground test sites to the surrounding waters and air has been predicted and is inevitable; this embodies the environmental nightmare that the people of the South Pacific have long dreaded.

According to the international physicians for the prevention of nuclear war, underground nuclear tests, such as those at Moruroa Atoll, cause radioactivity to leak out into the sea and reach human beings through the food chain. Previous nuclear explosives in the South Pacific have resulted in a number of epidemic-like outbreaks in surrounding communities, where symptoms included damage to the nervous system, paralysis, impaired vision, nausea and diarrhoea. I do not find it surprising that reports of increased cancer rates among Tahitians have surfaced. The damage to the marine environment can only be imagined.

Political leaders in French Polynesia, including French Polynesia's President Gaston Flosse, have registered strong objection to resume nuclear testing in their homeland. A hostile reaction from the Tahitian public is generating and efforts to discourage violence are being undertaken. Understandably, the people of French Polynesia are greatly disturbed by the rebirth of the nuclear monster in their midst and the nuclear poison to be spawned.

I and many other Pacific islanders have the greatest respect for French oceanographer Jacques-Yves Cousteau, who over the years came to the shores of many South Pacific islands for research and while there gained a special sensitivity for the pacific lifestyle and our vital dependence on the sea. Jacques Cousteau, in my mind, is the leading international spokesman for protection of the environment and conservation of all forms of marine life.

I am gratified to learn that Jacques Cousteau has condemned his Government's decision to resume exploding nuclear bombs in the South Pacific. In a statement from Paris, Cousteau stated his regret that France has given in to outdated arguments, as great wars are of the past. Cousteau declared that today's wisdom makes it necessary to outlaw atomic arms.

With French opinion polls documenting Jacques Cousteau as the leading popular figure in France, I would urge him to take up the fight with the good people of France to stop their Government's resumption of nuclear bomb detonations in French Polynesia. Jacques Cousteau, perhaps more than anyone else, has a unique and keen appreciation of how nuclear bomb explosions constitute the ultimate rape of the South Pacific's fragile marine environment.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I say to the good people of France, your Government has already exploded over 200 nuclear bombs and yet it seeks to further pollute the South Pacific with eight more nuclear bomb detonations. With the world moving toward agreement that nuclear weapons should be outlawed, France's action encourages the exact opposite. By dismissing criticism of additional tests with the excuse that France has tested less than other nuclear powers, France opens a Pandora's box that may undermine negotiation of a comprehensive test ban treaty. This also leaves the door open to justify China's nuclear testing program and the fact that China has only tested 34 nuclear detonations, so by this reason let us allow China to test 174 times or explode 174 more nuclear bombs, and then in addition to that let us allow China to explode 900 more nuclear bombs to catch up with the United States.

What madness, Mr. Speaker. What madness.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following article:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1995]

CHIRAC, THE OLD NEO-GAULLIST, IN THE LEAD

(By Craig R. Whitney)

TOURS, FRANCE, March 21.—Jacques Chirac, the Mayor of Paris, who has run for the French presidency and lost twice, now looks set to win on his third attempt, unless every public opinion poll is wrong or some surprise turns up before the runoff on May 7.

Mr. Chirac surged past his fellow conservative, Prime Minister Édouard Balladur, a month ago to become the favorite to succeed President François Mitterrand, a Socialist, who has been in office 14 years.

How Mr. Chirac, a 62-year-old conservative politician, has managed to make himself the image of change incarnate is the phenomenon of the 1995 presidential campaign.

His supporters say he has done it by patiently cultivating the grass roots since the summer of 1993 and listening hard to what voters say they want. With unemployment stuck at over 12 percent and French industries struggling under the burdens of an expansive welfare state, what many voters want is change, and Mr. Chirac has convinced a lot of them that he can deliver.

Although himself a graduate of the elite School of National Administration, Mr. Chirac says he wants to free France from technocrats and restore the egalitarian values that have given the country vitality for 200 years. He has promised job creation by making it less costly for businesses to hire new employees.

By now, Mr. Chirac is greeted by big crowds wherever he goes. Five thousands people—students and pensioners, farmers and workers—packed a fairgrounds hall outside Tours on Tuesday night to hear him explain how he would restore hope and unity to a country that he says is troubled by a lack of self-confidence.

"What I expect from him if he wins is a big reduction in unemployment," said Jean-Charles Paronnaud, a 28-year-old unemployed supermarket clerk.

Another supporter, Marie-Jeanne Avril, said: "I'm here because I'm an old Gaullist. For 45 years I've been voting for the general, even though he left us long ago, and this time I'll vote for Chirac."

Mr. Chirac founded his and Mr. Balladur's party, Rally for the Republic, in 1976 to per-

petuate the legacy of President Charles de Gaulle, the founder of the Fifth Republic. He often shares the general's stubborn vision of France's destiny in a Europe of proudly separate countries rather than as part of a federal United States of Europe.

Given France's economic and financial problems, if he does win this spring Mr. Chirac may also need de Gaulle's ability to convince people that he knows what they want and then to carry through on it, whether they like it or not.

"Politicians all make promises, but this is the first time I've met one who actually seemed interested in listening to me," said Jacques Maurice, a 47-year-old homeless man from Pithiviers whom Mr. Chirac met on the way to Tours. "He'll get my vote," Mr. Maurice said.

Part of Mr. Chirac's appeal has been that, unlike the stiff Mr. Balladur, Mr. Chirac seems to enjoy rubbing elbows with voters and to be at ease with himself. On his campaign tour, he wore a dark green top coat over his suit, and his slicked-back hair looked almost as much in need of a trim as Mr. Maurice's.

But Mr. Chirac's personal image is carefully thought out, as is the impassioned delivery of his campaign speech—a crooning baritone that always recites a prepared text. Nonetheless, his hourlong stump speech here was often drowned out by cheers. "I refuse the idea that one France, more and more people all the time, is doomed to be left behind while the other is more and more heavily taxed to come to its aid with welfare instead of jobs," he told the crowd. "We have to break this vicious circle."

Audiences have also taken to his pro-Main Street, anti-Wall Street style. Capital should be at the service of the people it employs, he tells them, not parked in high-yield bonds.

More and more people are obviously convinced that he has the right answers. Two public opinion polls published on Tuesday showed Mr. Chirac pulling farther ahead of both his Socialist opponent, Lionel Jospin, and Mr. Balladur.

With at least four other candidates expected to be in the race, Mr. Chirac could win about 29 percent of the vote in the election's first round on April 23, the two surveys indicated, with as much as 22 percent for Mr. Jospin and 17 percent for the Prime Minister. A poll for the weekly magazine Express showed Mr. Chirac could handily defeat either candidate in the runoff between the two top vote-getters on May 7.

Though he served as Prime Minister under Mr. Mitterrand between 1986 and 1988, Mr. Chirac seldom mentions him by name. He ran against Mr. Mitterrand in 1988 for the presidency, and lost.

When the conservatives won the parliamentary elections in March 1993, Mr. Chirac chose to stay in city hall and let Mr. Balladur find out the hard way what it was like to be Prime Minister and run for President at the same time.

If he has been vindicated by that choice, Mr. Chirac also has some things to live down. One of them is what critics characterized as a chauvinist appeal to the nation made at the end of 1978, when he called for a disavowal of Mr. Giscard d'Estaing's pro-European policies, and spoke darkly of the menace of "the foreigners' party." Ever since, some politicians in Germany have questioned what relations with France would be like if Mr. Chirac became President.

German prowess remains very much on Mr. Chirac's mind. Speaking of the possibility of establishing a common European currency by the end of the decade, Mr. Chirac said he might call for a referendum to be sure France wanted to merge the franc with the German mark and other bills.

"The core of the problem, as General de Gaulle often said, is not whether we surrender this or that bit of sovereignty, but whether we do so on the same terms as Germany does," he said.

WE NEED ANSWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some reluctance, but with some determination, to raise some questions about a very serious matter that occurred a short time ago. Together with Captain O'Grady we all thank God upon his return. It was, in fact, a miracle that he has been returned to us seemingly unharmed, and for that we are all very, very grateful, but I think some questions need to be asked about the circumstances under which Captain O'Grady had found himself in the air within the range of a SAM SA-6 missile.

In reviewing some news reports and some quotes of some individuals recently, I was prompted to go back to a report that the House Republican task force on terrorism and unconventional warfare issued in June of 1993 about issues related to this subject. In that month we issued a report, and I would like to read a part of it because it has a direct bearing on this issue.

Part of the report says the Serbian forces operate four SAM regiments, with the main concentration of Serb air defenses around the Banja Luka Air Base, including one SA-2 regiment, one battery of SA-6's, and one battery of old triple-A anti-aircraft weaponry. Now this Banja Luka Air Base also has a facility located on it that repairs and upgrades SA-6 missiles. This was all confirmed in June of 1994 by a well-respected defense publication known as Jane's Defense Weekly when they confirmed all of the information we had in 1993. Unfortunately for us, I think, on June 2 General Shalikashvili, in being interviewed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, said, and I quote:

"We had absolutely no intelligence that Serb SAM's were in the area. For months," he said, "if not for years, there had never been detected an air defense site in that area," and he said the words "Banja Luka."

So I have very serious concerns about the fact that we knew this 3 years ago, that Jane's Defense Weekly reported it in 1994, and our top officials at the Pentagon seemingly had no idea that this in fact was the case, and so I think it raises some very, very important questions.

We read in the other news report more recently, June 13, after we released our report from 1993 just recently to the press, and that was reported that Ken Bacon, spokesman at the Pentagon, said at that time, "Finally, we were well aware of the Banja Luka facility where the Bosnian Serbs

repair and maintain surface-to-air missile systems. The F-16 that Captain O'Grady was flying on June 2 was shot down outside of the area known as the threat envelope of the Banja Luka SAMs."

Now the F-16, as far as I can determine from news reports and from other information that we have been able to gather, was shot down less than 40 kilometers from Banja Luka. It is important to know that these SA-6's are track-mounted vehicles along with a second track-mounted vehicle which carries the radar which integrates into the system, travels 30 or 40 miles per hour, and so certainly it should have been considered, in my opinion, within the envelope that short distance from Banja Luka, and it seems to me that anyone making plans to carry out these missions should have taken that into consideration.

So I think this raises at least three questions, maybe more:

No. 1, what intelligence did the field commanders have at their disposal while making these very, very important and life-threatening decisions?

No. 2, what were the operational policies, and where were they made? What were the operational policies?

Our information is that there were 2 F-16's, and normally, if there is a threat of surface-to-air missiles, there are five aircraft, including radar jamming aircraft. I believe F-4's, known as Wild Weasels, would normally accompany our F-16's on these types of missions to guard against the type of events that actually happened.

No. 3, was it not reasonable to assume that Banja Luka, less than 40 kilometers away, was in fact part of the dangerous envelope into which these airplanes were flying?

So I would just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this:

In 1993 we were able to gain information that said this was a danger. Jane's Weekly reported in 1994 that this was a danger. Captain O'Grady was shot down proving that it was a danger, and we planned and carried out the mission anyway.

I would like answers to those questions. I have requested the same. I have requested Chairman SPENCE to hold hearings on this issue. I would like to know who is making these decisions, and where they are being made, and under what circumstances they are being made. We have other pilots, soldiers and sailors to think about. I believe this is a very serious issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CORRECTIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today I attended the annual memorial service held at the two Jima Memorial in Arlington, VA sponsored by the Correctional Peace Officers Foundation, Inc., as part of National Correctional Peace Officers Memorial Week. This service was held to commemorate the sacrifice of those correctional peace officers who died in the line of duty and to honor their families. I should like to submit for the RECORD the names of those individuals honored, together with the circumstances surrounding the individuals' deaths.

Inspector Stephen Stewart, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Huntsville, Texas. Killed on January 7, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Debbie Stewart and three children, Clayton—age 22, Casey—age 21, and David—age 11½. Mr. Stewart was a Correctional Officer prior to promoting to Inspector. While transporting an inmate work crew, his vehicle spun out in gravel overturning the vehicle. Inspector Stewart was killed at the site.

Group Supervisor Arnold Garcia, Los Angeles County Probation Department, Dorothy Cirby Center Residential Facility, Downey, California. Killed on April 4, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Alma Garcia and four children, Christian—age 15, Fatima—age 11, Joseph—age 8, and Anthony—age 2. Supervisor Garcia was struck in the head with a desk leg and beaten to death by two wards who attacked him during the graveyard shift in the dormitory housing unit. The two wards were apprehended in a railroad yard trying to leave the area.

Correctional Officer Dennis Stemen, Allen Correctional Institution, Ohio Department of Corrections, Lima, Ohio. Killed on July 5, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Patty Stemen and four children, Elizabeth—age 9½, Johah—age 7½, Jordan—age 5, and Bethany—age 3. Officer Stemen was killed following a transportation detail of an inmate to a hospital for treatment. After dropping off the inmate at the hospital some hours from his institution, he and another correctional officer were asked to stay and work due to a shortage of correctional officers at the hospital. Later, they started the long drive back to their facility when the vehicle they were driving left the road causing Officer Stemen's death. He was killed when he was ejected from the State van.

Correctional Sergeant Marc Perse, Colorado Territorial Correctional Facility, Colorado Department of Correction, Canon City, Colorado. Killed on August 15, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Pam Perse. While a member of the S.O.R.T. TEAM, Sgt. Perse was killed during a rappelling training exercise which required him to rappel down a 90 foot tower. Sergeant Perse was killed when his equipment failed.

Warden Charles Farquhar and wife Doris Farquhar, State Cattle Ranch, Alabama Department of Corrections, Greensboro, Alabama. Killed on October 23, 1994. Surviving: Son Robbie and his wife Nita, and two grandchildren, Drew—age 11, and Charlie—age 5. Warden Farquhar and his wife Doris were assaulted by trustee inmates at the State Cattle Ranch, beaten to death and then burned in their house. Several inmates were also killed trying to come to the Farquhar's aid.

Correctional Officer Louis Perrine, Powder River Correctional Facility, Oregon Department of Corrections. Killed on November 17, 1994. Surviving: Wife, Marilyn and three children, Steven—age 29, Anthony—age 27, and

Audra—age 25. Officer Perrine was killed during the supervision of an inmate work crew. During heavy winter storms, he was trying to clear an area with a tractor/grader when it flipped, rolling over on Officer Perrine and killing him instantly.

Senior Correctional Officer D'Atonion "Tony" Washington, Georgia State Penitentiary, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Atlanta, Georgia. Killed December 12, 1994. Surviving: Mother—Delphine and Father Frederick. Officer Washington was alone in a housing unit when he instructed an inmate to move to another area and the inmate assaulted him and beat him to death.

Lieutenant Robert Boud, Essex County Jail Annex, Department of Public Safety, Caldwell, New Jersey. Killed on January 8, 1995. Surviving: Wife, Kathy and four children, Katie—age 17, William—age 15, Matthew—age 10, and Kimberly—age 22. Lieutenant Boud died of a heart attack immediately following an inmate altercation/struggle.

Correctional Officer Leonard Trudeau, Metro/Dade County Department of Corrections, Florida. Killed on January 16, 1995. Surviving: Ex-Wife, Brenda and one child, Christina—age 12. Officer Trudeau was enroute home following his shift when he came upon a vehicle accident. While assisting the involved motorists as a good samaritan, another vehicle happened upon the accident at too high a rate of speed and while trying to avoid hitting the already involved vehicle, the second vehicle hit the guard rail and hit Officer Trudeau.

Mr. Speaker, we owe these people who have made the ultimate sacrifice and their families who must live with the consequences of that sacrifice an unparalleled debt of gratitude. Our hearts go out to the families—the spouses, children, siblings, and parents—and our prayers go up to God in their behalf. May we honor the deceased's sacrifice by so living our lives that we each may do our part to make this country a better place in which to live.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent Supreme Court rulings that raise the hurdle of educational and economic opportunity for millions of minority citizens in America, I rise this evening to speak about the philosophical questions now facing this Nation with respect to affirmative action.

Many of us saw the headlines after Adarand was decided, and of course it behooves the national media to claim that affirmative action, or maybe equal opportunity, was dead. But let me begin with the general principles and philosophy of affirmative action by posing the simple yes or no question:

Does American society today provide all, all of its citizens, with an equal opportunity to succeed? I would imagine, if you were truthful, what your answer would be, and if you actually answer this question with a yes, you must be one of the following: unfortunately alarmingly uninformed, or maybe far less than forthright, or sadly a Republican Presidential candidate for office, or some of my Republican colleagues

offering antidiscrimination legislation in this body.

How else could one deny that which we all know in our hearts to be true, and that is that, while we are all created equal, we, by no means, are treated equally in our society.

As initially conceived by the Johnson administration and as put in place by the Nixon administration, bipartisan Federal affirmative action programs were never intended as and have never been applied as a knee-jerk set of quota rules and regulations. Nor have affirmative action programs ever sanctioned the hiring or promotion of unqualified individuals over those who are eminently more qualified. Who would abide by that?

Affirmative action has always been and remains a good-faith effort to help historically underprivileged Americans compete on a more equal footing in the areas of education, business, employment, housing, and finance, simply attaining the American dream. For if we are to ever attain our American ideal of a colorblind society, which many would raise in debates all across this Nation, carrying the flag and suggesting that all they want is a colorblind society, which is where all men and women, boys and girls, are judged solely by the content of their character, not the color of their skin, first stated, by the way, by Dr. Martin Luther King, then clearly we must come to terms with our less-than-egalitarian past.

While we focus on our brutal 400-year legacy of slavery that ended merely technically only some 30 years ago, with the passage of our Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts, or the "glass ceiling" that has kept women from achieving, like their male counterparts, in the American workplace, it is obvious that we must do more to include a wider variety of our citizens' talents, energies, and potential of all aspects of American life. The Bush administration established the Glass Ceiling Commission to keep track of report on minority employment and trends in American business.

Mr. Speaker as most of my colleagues know, the Commission's February report told us that 95 percent of the top executive jobs in America's top 2,000 corporations are still held by white men, many of whom I have had the opportunity to dialog with, heads of these corporations who have said we are still working and striving to create diversity at the higher levels.

That information can logically lead us to two possible conclusions: Either majority males are naturally superior to all human beings and, therefore, rightfully merit their positions, or there is still troublesome and pervasive discrimination at work in our society.

There are all kinds of discrimination. Let us be realistic. Some is subtle, even subconscious, such as when a majority male executive—who happened to be hired by a majority male executive—has to decide between two similarly qualified job applicants, another

majority male and perhaps a minority female.

By doing what statistics tell us he probably will; that is, hire the majority male, our executives have not necessarily engaged in overt, willful acts of discrimination, racism, or sexism. I am certainly saying and not suggesting that all majority male executives would do any of this. But the effect is the same. It occurs, it happens. Ninety-five percent of those positions are held by majority males.

And I should note, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there are thousands of acts of overt and willful discrimination occurring every day, and we can bury our heads in the sand and pretend these virulent problems do not exist, or we can openly discuss our lingering racism and sexism in ways to improve and reform our affirmative action programs.

But rather than enter into a reasonable discussion of this critical national issue, many demagogues have chosen their scapegoats and now seek to exploit the economic anxieties of millions of Americans, and that is why the headlines, and the talk shows and the blame game.

The demagogues want Americans who are justifiably worried about a rapidly changing global economy to believe that the minorities are to blame for their economic woes.

They want us to believe that welfare mothers are to blame for all of America's troubles.

That hard-working legal immigrants should be distrusted.

And that all young African-American males are potential criminals and thus incapable of contributing to the strength of America.

This is shameful, this is nonsense. Mr. Speaker, I call upon this House, I call upon the Senate, I call upon the leadership of this Nation and all of the American people to answer the question of equality truthfully. Have we reached it? Absolutely not. Can we do it? Yes, we can. Can we do it together? Absolutely.

I challenge this society and America, Let's do it together and create a true equality for all Americans, real affirmative action.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, serving in a body as unique as this is in the world, I believe the only such representative body in the world as our House of Representatives reveals, we still have the people exercising the ultimate decision as to whom they want to represent them in this most formidable and auspicious and important body known as our national legislative branch.

□ 1445

It used to be that even though you have open and free elections, the limitations were of such a nature that the general citizenry in a given sector had not too much choice between candidates, to a certain extent perhaps it is true today because of the horrendous cost in campaigning in modern day American politics and the consequent power behind the power going to those who have the money, directly or indirectly.

I rise as one of the most privileged persons, not only in the United States, but I think in the world. I have said this often and from the beginning. In no other country would the likes of myself, with no particular economic recourse, social position, or the like, have won election in an entire county with the most formidable opposition that could be developed, well monied, well prepared, and as an individual with no particular economic resources, but having had the privilege of serving in varying capacities since youth, had been in intimate contact and association with every sector, not just of my own neighborhood, but the county.

That, again, happened because of unique circumstances. I was one of the so-called first breakthroughs in that area of the country. But even at that dim age, it was considered quite a startling event that the then county judge, also serving as juvenile court judge, would have picked me to head the juvenile court staff in that county at that time. That is quite a number of years ago. It was my first exposure to the public matter. The last thing I ever thought would be that I would be engaged in seeking public office. I grew up in the context of the world that is long gone past, and structured so differently from today that there is no way I could bring to today's mind and evoke that period of time.

I rise because there are very important things happening that the average citizen is not going to know about, even after they happen, until he feels the impact or the effect, if at all it becomes that noticeable. This has been the sorry fate for some decades now. Instead of this being the most deliberative, considered body, with debate, full-blown debate, that has not been the case for quite some decades.

If I were to be asked after all these years and all of this what is the thing you think, it isn't any great accomplishment or anything, but I think the greatest thing I would say is that I did stimulate and create the conditions for debate, where there would be no escaping and sashaying with fine toe dancing out of the issues.

Now, next week the Committee on Banking and Finance, as it is known now, is expected to mark up what euphoniously is called a regulatory relief bill. The number of that bill is H.R. 1362. I say it should be 1313, because it is sure going to be unlucky for the consumers if it gets enacted. It is equally bad for bank safety, believe it or not,

and a disaster as far as public beneficial and creative policy is concerned.

Some of it, of course, like most things, makes some sense. There are parts of the banking statute that impose needless burdens, and we enacted legislation last year that repealed a pretty good substantial number of duplicative or needless or outdated regulations. We did that last year. But, unhappily, the bill that the Committee on Banking and Financial Services is about to take up is a grab bag of banking, lobbyist-driven excesses. As reported from the subcommittee, the bill guts important safety and soundness regulations, rips the heart out of basic consumer protection laws, and grants legal protection for careless and crooked bank officers and directors.

It is unbelievable, yet we have got it. I feel it urgent enough for me to take time on this day, where normally I would be preparing to go home, in order to bring the attention of my colleagues, including those who are members of the committee, about this.

In addition to that, as bad as that is, the bill effectively prohibits the Justice Department from enforcing fair lending laws, which took years of struggle for us to finally have enacted some time ago. Oh, the lobbyists are celebrating greatly, but the bank customers and the taxpayers, my advice is you better check your wallets. You are about to be fleeced.

Here is an example. Under this bill a customer whose credit card is lost or stolen has his liability jacked up tenfold, tenfold. If an ATM card is lost or stolen, the customer's whole bank account can easily be wiped out, with no recourse.

What this means is that credit cards are about to become far riskier to customers, so much so that they might want to tear up their automatic teller cards and rely on old-fashioned transactions with bank tellers. But many banks are raising their fees, so customers, if they can find a bank in their neighborhood, may find it too expensive to do that.

The bill makes it a whole lot easier for banks to engage in discriminatory practices. Can you feature that? After all of this ado over these years about antidiscrimination fights and please, thanks to one especially zany amendment, the Justice Department is barred from investigating fair lending cases.

Another provision wipes out laws that provide the information and the data that can provide lending discrimination. Fully 35 percent of lenders are exempted from the Home Mortgage and Disclosure Act. Therefore, under this bill, even if the Justice Department wanted to investigate a case, it would not have access to lending data.

And that is not all. The bill wipes out any kind of case built on desperate impact theories, cases that attack situations that look fair but are in fact discriminatory in their result. This means about the only way a customer could win a fair lending case is for the lend-

ing officer to say flat out, "We do not make loans to your kind of people."

Banks will have nothing to fear, or if they want to engage in discriminatory lending, they can do so, as long as they are not just absolutely blatant about it.

This provision, in my book, makes the bill unacceptable on its own. But the bank lobby grab bag bill gets even worse. Bank officers and directors whose bank fails, mind you, here are banks, bank owners and directors who fail, either through incompetency or crookedness or what have you, will have the taxpayer pick up the tab. They will have a whole lot less to worry about under this bill. It is a rollback to what we have for years fought so much against in the past.

The Government will have to accept settlement offers or run the risk of having to pay the legal costs of the defendants. Defendants are given new defenses that the courts have refused to accept. A bank president with a bad business judgment gets off scot-free, because under this bill stupidity is made a valid defense against liability.

Oddly enough, if you can say that anything more could be odder, the vast new protection this bill grants the bank insiders come from the very party that regularly ridicules the Government for not recovering more money from the crooks and the incompetents who raided banks throughout the wild days of the eighties.

You would think that the party of rugged responsibility, and that is my opposition party, the so-called Republican Party, would want to demand that bank officers and directors be responsible. But far from it. They are making it far easier for incompetence and outright hooligans to rob a whole new generation of banks and customers.

One idea the Republicans had was to exempt the whole new class of banks from the requirement that the bank audit committee actually be independent and objective, not the captive management and insiders. But an outside audit committee is only required for a big bank, those of \$500 million resources or more.

Thankfully, we may be able to preserve this protection. It sounds like a small thing, but the eighties taught us that a bank that does not have an independent audit committee has very little protection against a crooked management. If the majority changes its mind, the opposition party, and insists on gutting the independent audit committee requirement, my friends and fellow citizens, you better get ready for a fast increase in the number of banks that are robbed from the inside by their own management.

Inside robberies would be made easier by yet another provision of the bill that remains in place, a huge new increase in loans permitted for insiders.

Now, banks used to be chartered for a reason. In fact, that is still the basic law. This was the exact and single-

mindful purpose for the chartering of a bank. Public need and convenience. Those were the words of the statute as enacted originally. Public need, convenience, or necessity.

One thing you would like to have is a bank that makes loans to the community. We have a very simple law, and, incidentally, the banks hate it, to try to target that, the Community Reinvestment Act. Banks hate the idea of having to show that they are doing a service to the community. The administration has responded to legitimate concerns about complexity in compliance with community reinvestment. So a new regulation is now in place that should make life a whole lot simpler for everyone.

But lo and behold, the banks did not want a regulation that is sensible or easy to live with. They do not want anything that requires them to show they are serving the customers.

□ 1500

So the bill now in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, true to lobby demands, would exempt 90 percent of all banks from having to comply with the Community Reinvestment Act at all and renders the law, consequently, meaningless and useless for the rest.

Still other parts of this nefarious bill apparently will enable banks to change their charges and fees without prior notice, without any notice, just arbitrarily. This, of course, will make banks one of the few businesses in the country that do not have to tell customers about price changes. It is absolutely unbelievable to me, a child of the depression era in which we saw, felt, and suffered the excesses of the banks then that are now being put back in. So I think anybody who knows me knows exactly that this is what I would be doing today.

Banks already do not have a list price on their main product; that is, loans. Most loans are tied to a prime rate number, but guess what, the great majority of loans are made well above or well below that price. Favored customers pay below the posted rate, but small businesses pay more, lots more. Of course, since there is no meaningful disclosure law, bank customers have a hard time finding the best deal. It is about to get harder for bank customers to know much about price changes or other bank services as well, check processing, credit card fees or whatever else, because this pending bill apparently strips away requirements that such price changes be disclosed.

Another provision of this bill wipes out any meaningful disclosure about interest payments on customer deposits. So when you understand this bill, you discover that the customer loses any ability to easily find out who offers the best deal on deposits and who offers the best deal on services. The customer also suffers huge new liabilities in the case of credit card or ATM loss or fraud. The bank regulatory re-

lief bill may deny some lobbyist some way, a wish or a hope, but it is their relief bill still. I cannot think of a lobbyist that the bill leaves unhappy.

I have been around here some time, privileged to have been so by the constituents in the 20th Congressional District of Texas for a good period. Since my special election in 1961, to be precise. So I have been here long enough to know that whenever there is a feeding frenzy like this, it is the poor folks out on the beltway who will end up crying and gyped and stolen from.

No matter how you look at it, this legislation will make it difficult or impossible for customers to know what a bank is charging for loans and services. This is incredible to me, a child of that period of time in which it was obvious that the suffering demanded that there be regulatory imposition. And here, now, has moved full circle. So that it is impossible for customers to know what a bank is charging for loans and services and close to impossible to avoid huge losses in credit card or ATM card frauds, virtually impossible to win a case involving discrimination and very much likely to be paying more for bank fraud and mismanagement, which are bound to increase, of course, thanks to the way this bill shreds safety and the soundness requirements.

When this legislation reaches the floor, it will be called regulatory relief. A better name is, customer grief bill. The lobbyists and the special interests have run amok, and if this bill is enacted, it will be a sad day for the customer and the taxpayer. Instead of making up this bill next week, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services would be better advised to tear it up and to start all over.

I wish somehow and, in fact, pray that something happens in the interim in that we can prevail and perhaps do so. But the reality is that the chances of that happening are minimal and, therefore, I am reporting to my colleagues here on the record so that nobody can say that nobody told them so.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY.) Visitors in the gallery should not express sentiment.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DICKEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of attending his son's wedding.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 12:35 p.m., on account of official business.

Mr. MINETA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after noon, on account of official business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAXTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WARD.

Ms. DELAURO.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. MEEHAN.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. WYNN.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. LAFALCE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SAXTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. CALLAHAN.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 19, 1995, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1063. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Germany for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-28), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1064. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in April 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 168. Resolution amending clause 4 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House to abolish the Consent Calendar and to establish in its place a Corrections Calendar (Rept. 104-144). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to revise the income estate, and gift tax rules applicable to individuals who lose U.S. citizenship; with an amendment (Rept. 104-145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1062. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than June 22, 1995.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FIELDS of Texas (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1869. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend the authorizations of appropriations of the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. MORELLA:

H.R. 1870. A bill to authorize appropriations for the activities of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology, and for Scientific and Technical Research Services and Construction of Research Facilities activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

H.R. 1871. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology Industrial Technology Services for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. STUDDS, Mr.

BILBRAY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1872. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs established pursuant to the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency Act of 1990; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BOUCHER:

H.R. 1873. A bill to provide for protection of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWDER:

H.R. 1874. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Talladega National Forest, AL; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

H.R. 1875. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FOLLIETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. VENTO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MINGE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1876. A bill to support proposals to implement the U.S. goal of the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines, to impose a moratorium on the use of antipersonnel landmines except in limited circumstances, to provide for sanctions against foreign governments that export antipersonnel landmines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOX (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1877. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow suits against foreign states for damages caused by torture, extrajudicial killing, and other terrorist acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBSON (for himself and Mr. HALL of Ohio):

H.R. 1878. A bill to extend for 2 years the period of applicability of enrollment mix requirement to certain health maintenance organizations providing services under the Dayton Area Health Plan; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HORN:

H.R. 1879. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Alamitos barrier recycled water project and in the Long Beach water desalination and reuse research and development project; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CRANE, Mr. YATES, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. EWING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. DURBIN):

H.R. 1880. A bill to designate the U.S. post office building located at 102 South McLean,

Lincoln, IL, as the "Edward Madigan Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 1881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat for unemployment compensation purposes Indian tribal governments the same as State or local units of government or as nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1882. A bill to consolidate the Administrator of General Services authorities relating to the control and utilization of excess and surplus property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, Science, International Relations, and Small Business, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH (for himself,

Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BARR, Mr. BONO, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON to Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KING, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PARKER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TATE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. WICKER):

H.R. 1883. A bill to strengthen parental, local, and State control of education in the United States by eliminating the Department of Education and redefining the Federal role in education; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1884. A bill to provide for school bus safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on

Economic and Educational Opportunities, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZELIFF:

H.R. 1885. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to regulate light and medium duty commercial vehicles; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to amend the War Powers Resolution; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. STARK, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

114. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to the Republic of China, Taiwan's, participation in the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WYNN introduced a bill (H.R. 1886) for the relief of John Wesley Davis; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 65: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 72: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 73: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 103: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 109: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 112: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 188: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 218: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 246: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 303: Mr. LOFGREN and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 311: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 359: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 447: Mr. KLINK, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 497: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 499: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 559: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 733: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 734: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 743: Mr. DREIER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. CRAZIO.

H.R. 782: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 789: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 863: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY.

H.R. 864: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 868: Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 882: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BURR, Mr. FRAZER, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 883: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FARR, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 899: Mr. POMBO, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1023: Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 1024: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1085: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1090: Mr. FOX and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1091: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1099: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 1114: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1119: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1172: Mr. MASCARA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CREMEANS, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 1204: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LINDER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1227: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1242: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1402: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1404: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. WARD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1459: Mr. FRAZER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1552: Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. THOMPSON, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 1568: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1580: Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ALLARD, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COOLEY, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1594: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BASS, Mr. FOX, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. CHRYSLER.

H.R. 1608: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1627: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1662: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SABO, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. WARD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1678: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. NEY, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. HORN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HEINEMAN, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1684: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BURR, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 1686: Mr. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 1768: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 1801: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. PAXON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. NEUMANN, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1807: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 1818: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. JOHN-SON of South Dakota.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mrs. KELLY.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. TALENT.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mrs. KELLY.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 1817

OFFERED BY: Mr. BREWSTER

AMENDMENT No. 9: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE —DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCKBOX
DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND; DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

SEC. 126. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Deficit Reduction Trust Fund" (in this title referred to as the "Fund").

(b) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist only of amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (c).

(c) TRANSFERS OF MONEYS TO FUND.—For each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays for discretionary programs (below the allocations for those programs for each such fiscal year under section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) resulting from the provisions of this Act, as calculated by the Director.

(d) USE OF MONEYS IN FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amounts in the Fund shall not be available, in any fiscal year, for appropriation, obligation, expenditure, or transfer.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall use the amounts in the Fund to redeem, or buy before maturity, obligations of the Federal Government that are included in the public debt. Any obligation of the Federal Government that is paid, redeemed, or bought with money from the Fund shall be canceled and retired and may not be re-issued.

(e) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Upon the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make downward adjustments in the adjusted discretionary spending limits (new budget authority and outlays) as set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998 by the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays transferred to the Fund under subsection (c) for such fiscal year, as calculated by the Director.

H.R. 1817

OFFERED BY: Mr. GUTIERREZ

AMENDMENT No. 10: On page 5, line 4, strike "\$72,537,000", and insert "\$69,914,000".

H.R. 1817

OFFERED BY: MR. HORN

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 3, line 3, insert "(less \$99,150,000)" before ", to remain".

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 3, line 3, strike "\$588,243,000" and insert "\$489,093,000".

H.R. 1854

OFFERED BY: MR. BREWSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE IV—DEFICIT REDUCTION
LOCKBOX

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND; DOWNWARD
ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING
LIMITS

SEC. 401. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Deficit Reduction Trust Fund" (in this title referred to as the "Fund").

(b) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist only of amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (c).

(c) TRANSFERS OF MONEYS TO FUND.—For each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays for discretionary programs (below the allocations for those programs for each such fiscal year under section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) resulting from the provisions of this Act, as calculated by the Director.

(d) USE OF MONEYS IN FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amounts in the Fund shall not be available, in any fiscal year, for appropriation, obligation, expenditure, or transfer.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall use the amounts in the Fund to redeem, or buy before maturity, obligations of

the Federal Government that are included in the public debt. Any obligation of the Federal Government that is paid, redeemed, or bought with money from the Fund shall be canceled and retired and may not be re-issued.

(e) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Upon the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make downward adjustments in the adjusted discretionary spending limits (new budget authority and outlays) as set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998 by the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays transferred to the Fund under subsection (c) of such fiscal year, as calculated by the Director.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. BREWSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE VI—DEFICIT REDUCTION
LOCKBOX

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND; DOWNWARD
ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING
LIMITS

SEC. 601. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Deficit Reduction Trust Fund" (in this title referred to as the "Fund").

(b) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist only of amounts transferred to the Fund under subsection (c).

(c) TRANSFERS OF MONEYS TO FUND.—For each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays for discretionary programs (below the allocations for those programs for each such

fiscal year under section 602(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) resulting from the provisions of this Act, as calculated by the Director.

(d) USE OF MONEYS IN FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amounts in the Fund shall not be available, in any fiscal year, for appropriation, obligation, expenditure, or transfer.

(2) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR REDUCTION OF PUBLIC DEBT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall use the amounts in the Fund to redeem, or buy before maturity, obligations of the Federal Government that are included in the public debt. Any obligation of the Federal Government that is paid, redeemed, or bought with money from the Fund shall be canceled and retired and may not be re-issued.

(e) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Upon the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make downward adjustments in the adjusted discretionary spending limits (new budget authority and outlays) as set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for each of the fiscal years 1996 through 1998 by the aggregate amount of estimated reductions in new budget authority and outlays transferred to the Fund under subsection (c) for such fiscal year, as calculated by the Director.

H.R. 1868

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: On page 5, line 14, delete "\$26,500,000" and insert "0".

On page 5, line 23, delete "\$79,000,000" and insert "0".

AMENDMENT NO. 3: On page 5, line 14, delete "\$26,500,000" and insert "1".

On page 5, line 23, delete "\$79,000,000" and insert "1".