



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1995

No. 138

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

### PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Robert F. Browning, pastor of First Baptist Church, Somerset, KY, offered the following prayer:

Father, You have been so good to us and we thank You for many blessings today. Thank You for trusting us to make decisions. Help us to be wise. Thank You for giving us responsibility. Help us to be industrious. Thank You for allowing us to be leaders in this great country. Help us to follow You as we lead Your people. Thank You for giving us families along our journey. Help us to be faithful to them. Thank You, most of all, for Your abiding presence, gracious love, strengthening arm, and forgiving Spirit. May we be humble recipients and bold ambassadors. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas 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.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize 15 Members on each side for 1-minute.

### REQUEST FOR LIMITATION OF TIME FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on the defense bill today that we have a limitation of 5 hours on the bill and all amendments thereto.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I object. We are talking about \$244 billion. I think we need more debate than 5 hours.

Mr. MURTHA. How about 6 hours?

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SANDERS. I think it is something that should be discussed perhaps in a little while when people get together. I do not have an objection to a time limit. But I cannot agree to a certain time limit now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair seeks to accommodate Members, and this has been an interesting colloquy. The Chair thinks if the gentlemen can get together, the Chair will be glad to recognize someone at an appropriate moment.

### WELCOME TO REV. DR. ROBERT F. BROWNING

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Bob Browning, who offered today's opening prayer as the guest House Chaplain, is my hometown pastor, friend, and personal counselor.

He is the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Somerset, KY, a church of some 2,000 members.

Although a young man, Brother Browning has packed into his years an impressive career in service to God and his people.

He just last year finished two 1-year terms as president of the Kentucky Baptist Convention, a sure sign of the esteem felt for Brother Browning by his peers and religious leaders throughout Kentucky.

But, no wonder to us, his home church members, we have watched his leadership abilities grow and develop since he came to us in 1982 following pastorships at three other Kentucky churches and receiving his doctorate degree at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville.

In addition to various responsibilities with the State association, he has been called upon by the entire community. He serves on everything from the YMCA board to the county solid waste advisory committee. He is a trustee at Cumberland College. He has worked as a volunteer in Africa, Brazil, and Russia.

Brother Bob and his wife Jackie are the parents of three wonderful children: Jason, Amy, and Joshua. Jason is a marine, based in California.

Brother Bob is a wonderful preacher. But his greatest gift is his ability to counsel, one on one. I can personally testify to the warm and caring love he imparts to those who are so fortunate to be in his care. He has been of enormous importance to me and my family in recent months, especially.

Welcome Brother Browning to the people's House, your House.

### LET US CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE B-2

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

□ 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

H8599

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, today the House will take up the Defense appropriations bill, and one of the most important amendments will be on the B-2 bomber. Ever since 1980, when Secretary Harold Brown announced that we would build a stealth bomber, I have felt that this was the most important technological breakthrough in modern military history.

In the Gulf war, the F-117, a stealth attack aircraft, was able to penetrate the most difficult targets and knock out surface-to-air missiles and radars without losing pilots and doing it in a matter of hours. Other airplanes that were not stealthy were unable to penetrate without a large number of support aircraft.

The B-2 gives us a plane that can carry eight times as much as the F-117 and five times as far. In a world where we are going to have a smaller U.S. military, having worldwide reach, being able to stop mobile divisions coming from North Korea, say, into South Korea or into the gulf, is a revolutionary capability. Let us continue to support the B-2.

#### HOW TO PROTECT OUR CHILDREN'S FUTURE

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, a lot has changed over the last 9 months of the Republican controlled Congress.

As Members of Congress went home for their August recess, they listened to their constituents. Their constituents continued to ring the bell that was heard loudly last November by voters around this country when they decided to change the makeup of the U.S. Congress. They said that they wanted a smaller, less costly, less intrusive government, and they reiterated their demands over August.

As we look to the fall with a lot of confusion, a lot of activity, let me make it perfectly clear that Republicans in Congress are going to balance the budget over the next 7 years to save the future for our children; that we are going to strengthen, preserve, and protect Medicare for our senior citizens; that we are going to reform welfare, where we reward work and take away the incentives for illegitimacy today; and, last, our fourth objective is to reduce the tax load on middle-income Americans and provide incentives to have a strong, healthy economy so that we ensure that we actually balance the budget over the next 7 years.

This is what we must do to protect our children's future.

#### THE B-2 BOMBER IS COST-EFFECTIVE

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission

to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of continuing the B-2 program. The B-2 bomber protects our sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters, the women and men of the military looking out for this Nation.

When we send our people to battle, we want to send them with the best equipment we have available and we want to send them in as small a number as possible to save lives. This is what the B-2 will do. The B-2 can replace many of the fighter planes in a very stealth way. It will cost more per individual plane, but when we compare the fact that it can replace 70 some planes on each mission, it is worth it. It is cost effective.

Mr. Speaker, at least seven former Secretaries of Defense have noted the B-2 bomber is the most cost-effective means of rapidly projecting force over great distances.

#### KEEP THE B-2 BOMBER

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, today we will hold an important vote on the future of our Nation's bomber force.

With this in mind, I would like to outline excerpts from a recent report by the Congressional Research Service on the B-2 bomber. This is a neutral organization that does not advocate or oppose defense programs. Members opposed to modernizing our bomber fleet will discuss what they view as alternatives to the B-2. Listen to what the report says about these alternatives:

Alternative No. 1.—Tactical aircraft. Tactical aircraft are manpower intensive and require large numbers of tanker aircraft and nearby, properly equipped military bases or carriers from which to operate.

Alternative No. 2.—Cruise missiles. Cruise missiles are expensive—up to 70 times more costly than bomber-delivered direct-attack weapons—and offer comparatively little firepower.

Alternative No. 3.—Theater ballistic missiles—Theater-based ballistic missiles have very limited range and are also more costly than bomber-delivered direct-attack weapons. Of course, the fourth alternative is to do nothing and fly 1950's-era B-52's until they are 70 years old, which has been suggested by officials within our Defense Department. Last month, we witnessed a potential consequence of this mentality when an engine dropped from a B-52 in flight during a routine exercise.

We should not let this happen to the men and women of our Armed Forces. Vote no on the Obey-Dellums-Kasich amendment.

#### CUTTING MEDICARE TO PAY FOR TAX BREAKS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, 9 months ago the American public gave to the Republicans the opportunity to control this House of Representatives and the Senate. At that time the Republicans announced that they wanted to give very wealthy income taxpayers a huge tax break. How are they going to pay for it under the budget rules?

They are going to cut 270 billion dollars' worth of benefits out of the Medicare Program, \$270 billion. They are going to take away from all the senior citizens the right to choose their doctor. They are going to charge them more. These burdens will fall not only on the senior citizens but on their families, who will feel compelled to have to dig down in their pockets to take care of these people. This is unfair.

But the most unfair thing about all of this, Mr. Speaker, is this: In 2 weeks, we will be voting on the Committee on Ways and Means on this program, and this is the only copy of it that we have, this blank piece of paper. This stealth attack is unconscionable.

#### SCARE TACTICS REGARDING MEDICARE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my good friend from Florida who precedes me here in the well, and, Mr. Speaker, we see yet another example of Medi-Scare. You see, if you do not want to solve a problem, you try to scare the H-E-double-hockey-sticks out of the American people. Scare them into an action; scare them into senseless fear.

But the fact remains this: Medicare goes bankrupt in 7 years if we do nothing. To the seniors who age into the program in 7 years, I ask, what do you do when there is no program there? For the seniors who are living under the program now, I ask, what happens when it goes bankrupt?

We are willing to work with our friends in the new minority to come up with a plan to save this vital program. We want to enlarge options; we want to have this program viable. But the one thing we do not need is more fear tactics. The one thing we need is constructive consistent work together to solve this vital problem confronting this Nation.

#### MEDICARE CUTS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan to cut \$270 billion from

Medicare to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy will cost seniors \$1,000 more a year and will mean that they will lose their choice of doctors. Amazingly, Republicans now say they are only following the Medicare trustees instructions and trying to save the program from insolvency.

But, yesterday, the Medicare trustees, themselves, spoke out on the Republican plan. In an editorial published in the Los Angeles Times, the trustees called the Republican Medicare cuts excessive and said those cuts would seriously hurt seniors.

And, contrary to Republican claims, the Medicare trustees say that the trust fund is not in a sudden crisis, but has actually improved over the past few years. As the trustees said yesterday: "The only thing that has really changed is the political needs of those who are hoping to use major Medicare cuts for other purposes." As we know, those other purposes are tax cuts for the wealthy.

#### LIMITATION OF TIME FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill H.R. 2126 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 205 continue for a period not to exceed 5 hours—excluding time consumed by recorded votes and proceedings incidental thereto.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### SUPPORT THE B-2

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of the B-2 stealth bomber, and in strong opposition to the Dellums/Kasich amendment to be offered later today to eliminate funding for future bombers.

In today's uncertain world, we will be lucky to have a day's warning before a conflict erupts. With our forward presence constantly shrinking, the B-2 provides us with the ability to rapidly project power deep within well-protected enemy territory.

Further, while the premium on surprise and quick strike ability is increasing, the premium placed on the lives of our service men and women remains paramount. With stealth and precision-guided munitions, one B-2 with a crew of two is as effective as 75 conventional aircraft which place 132 air crew at risk. And the B-2 can do this without being staged on the dangerous front lines of a conflict.

The options that the B-2 provides are vital to the future of our Nation's power projection capabilities. It is currently the only bomber in production,

and the only one planned. If the Dellums/Kasich amendment passes later today, we will lose these capabilities along with the ability to rapidly produce them in the future. If this amendment passes, by the year 2030, we will be sending our pilots into combat in 70 year old B-52's. This would be the same as sending our fighter pilots into Desert Storm in wooden and cloth biplanes.

And, the B-2 fits under the budget cap that was approved in the House earlier this year.

I urge a "no" vote on the Dellums-Kasich amendment when it is offered later today. Please join me in voting to maintain our nation's critical power projection capabilities.

#### ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

(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, illegal immigration is at an all-time high: 4 million illegal immigrants in America. A study now shows that many of them actually end up with food stamps, free health care, free education, free housing, while the Congress of the United States continues to cut money for American citizens. Unbelievable.

I say, ladies and gentlemen, it is time to put American military troops on our border. They are falling out of chairs without arm rests overseas and we have got millions of illegal immigrants, many of them running over our borders with back packs full of cocaine and heroin. Beam me up. Whoever created this immigration policy is in fact smoking dope.

#### THE B-52 BOMBER

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan said, "If we are forced to fight, we must have the means and the determination to prevail or we will not have what it takes to secure the peace." This then, is the B-2 Bomber's reason for existence.

The chairman and members of the National Security Committee have clearly supported the B-2. Numerous studies indicate that the United States will require more than 20 B-2 bombers to support the U.S. national military strategy and that makes the B-2 a critical part of our war fighting arsenal and will play a unique role in each and every air and land battle that lies ahead.

The aging fleet of B-52 and B-1 bombers will see their performance decline in the next 5 to 10 years and can never perform the stealth mission of the B-2. In fact, there are no new bombers on the drawing board for the next 20 years. Bottomline: The B-2 is an installment on Congress' promise to revitalize our national security posture.

I challenge each of you to think about the direction of this world. The notion that we are safe—or war is less likely—should be dismissed. The reality is their names may have changed but they are still there—ballistic missiles, chemical weapons, and nuclear weapons. We must have the ability to counter that threat. The time is now—I urge your vote of support for the B-2.

□ 1020

#### ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS ON THE MAJORITY'S HIT LIST

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, next Monday I will visit an elementary school, Franklin Elementary School, which is in my district in Houston. This is a school which demonstrates the need for a Federal role in education.

The schools in my district are not wealthy. They rely on Federal education dollars to supplement the State and local funding that they receive. Because of the funding problems that are all too common around the country, not just in Texas, the State and local money just is not enough to provide these children the education, the facilities, and resources these children deserve.

And yet, these kids, their parents, and their teachers kept plugging away. In 1994, the percentage of the students passing a State exam was 35 to 59 percent. In 1995, the percentage rose to 75 to 89 percent. How did this happen? With a dedicated principal, hard-working teachers, involved parents, and extra work on Saturdays, the students did it.

This is an inner-city school that receives chapter I funds. This is a school in which 98 percent of the students receive subsidized breakfast or lunch. In response to their commitment and success, the majority is cutting their funding. And I would like to say: "Welcome back, kids. Along with the seniors, you are on the majority's hit list."

#### AMERICA MUST PLAN FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing a lot about Medicare and the B-2 bomber. Actually, the two are related, because it seems that some Members continue to stick their head in the sand and deny basic facts.

First of all, if we do nothing on Medicare, in 7 years the trustees say that Medicare goes bankrupt. Something has to be done. We cannot ignore it. We have to face the 21st century with the facts.

The same is true with the B-2 bomber. If we do nothing on the B-2 bomber, if we go along with the Dellums-Kasich amendment, then we are sticking our head in the sand. By the year 2010, the B-52 heavy bombers that we have protecting this country will be over 50 years old.

We cannot sit back and do nothing anymore. We have to plan for the 21st century, not only in Medicare but also in protecting the shores and senior citizens and the young and the old alike.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to oppose the Dellums-Kasich amendment and support the B-2 bomber.

---

#### BIPARTISAN EFFORT IS NEEDED TO ADDRESS QUESTIONS OF ETHICS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, to resolve so many of the problems of this country, it is essential that Republicans and Democrats come together in a bipartisan fashion. We have seen in this session how this can work.

We have seen a 50-year-old lobbying law adjusted. We have seen a gift ban rule to ban gifts to Members of the Senate approved. And yesterday in a dramatic action, we saw Republicans join Democrats to actually vote to expel a Member.

But for some reason there is a line down the rotunda, and none of that bipartisanship is happening on this side of the Capitol. At the same time that action was being taken, this body was rejecting, on a party line basis, doing anything about gifts for Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, today also is the first anniversary, 1 year ago a complaint concerning GOPAC and the Speaker was made to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and we have done nothing but dillydallied.

It is time our Republican Members joined us and put a hand on the broom to sweep clean the questions of integrity concerning this House.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). It should be noted that Members should not refer to disciplinary actions in either House.

---

#### RESTORING HOPE AND OPPORTUNITY

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority has been diligently working to keep our promises to the American people. This fall we will

complete work on our balanced budget plan, save Medicare from bankruptcy, and allow working families and businesses to keep more of what they earn.

For too long, Washington's solution to America's problems was always new spending and new taxes. As a result, our national debt now exceeds \$4.9 trillion and the average American family pays more in taxes than it spends on clothing, food, and shelter combined.

This fall offers our best chance to honestly balance the budget, cut exorbitant taxes, and ensure that our children have a bright future that is free of debt and full of hope.

The choices are simple we can either spend now and worry later or we can move forward with an agenda that forces the Federal Government to live within its means, saves the American dream for our children, and lays the foundation for a generation of economic growth and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, there are no legitimate excuses for continuing to spend money that we do not have. It is time for Congress to quit avoiding the tough choices and restore some sanity to the Federal budget.

---

#### AMERICA NEEDS THE B-2 BOMBER

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, the current debate over the B-2 bomber marks a turning point for the preservation of U.S. air power. It has been said that the history of U.S. military power is characterized by technological achievements that produced globally dominating weapons systems. I would maintain that the B-2 bomber is just such a technological achievement. If we examine the core competencies of each of our branch of services, it would be evident that independent strategic bombardment has clearly become the unique core competency of our new U.S. Air Force. Indeed, the United States is no longer just a maritime power—we are an aerospace power, and this strategic air power is vital to our national security.

The President of this United States must continue to have the leverage to deter an aggressor by threatening to destroy most of its economic infrastructure with an immediate, devastating strike. If such a strike were necessary, it could be done with B-2's with minimum support, minimum risk, minimum collateral damage, and without U.S. ground force fatalities.

The B-2 has global range, high subsonic speed and an extremely low radar signature. It combines the most modern avionics with the ability to deliver precision weapons in all weather conditions. Having created this devastating capability I would urge my colleagues not to abandon it without truly understanding the facts. We must project our legacy in air power into the future—to do this we need the B-2 bomber.

#### MEDICARE IS GOING BROKE

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

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is going broke. Not maybe. Not way down the road. If this Congress does not address this crisis, our Medicare system will be out of money by the year 2002.

This is not an issue for partisan bickering. This is not an issue where business-as-usual is appropriate. The pending insolvency of Medicare threatens the availability of health care to more than 32 million of America's senior citizens.

The Medicare crisis was defined in April by the Medicare Board of Trustees—including Secretaries Reich, Shalala, and Rubin. In their report on the status of the Medicare Program, they indicate that "the Medicare program is clearly unsustainable in its present form" and they "strongly recommend that the crisis presented by the financial condition of the Medicare trust funds be urgently addressed."

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our senior citizens to face this Medicare crisis head on. It is the responsibility of Congress to fulfill our commitment to this country's seniors and initiate Medicare reform making this program financially sound now and in the years to come.

---

#### THE CRUEL HOAX OF MEDICARE'S INSOLVENCY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to correct this terrible hoax that the Republicans are playing on the American people, that somehow the Medicare Program is bankrupt or insolvent.

In fact, the trustee's report that came out this year showed dramatically that Medicare has never had more money available and, in fact, the life of the program is at least 7 years beyond this year. That is a longer period of time before Medicare goes insolvent than any other period of time that the trustees have reported on in the last few years.

The fact of the matter is that we cannot keep this Medicare Program with a huge pot of money, because if we did that, providers and others would want to raid the program to take advantage of that pot of money. Congress has historically kept the amount of money simply for a few years going in order to protect the program, and it is a cruel hoax on the American people to suggest that Medicare is going insolvent.

What the Republicans are doing is raiding the Medicare trust fund in order to finance a tax cut. It is that simply. They do not want to tell the truth about what is happening here. It is a huge tax cut for the richest Americans.

REPUBLICANS' VICTORY MESSAGE  
STILL RINGS LOUD AND CLEAR

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a lot has changed in Washington over the past 9 months, and the message that sent Republicans to victory last November is still ringing loud and clear.

Americans are not talking about how we balance the budget, but whether or not we will do so. People are also talking about how we save Medicare, not whether or not we will do so.

Our mission this fall is clear. We will pass a budget that brings us into balance by 2002. We will enact meaningful welfare reform that emphasizes work, families, and hope for the future. We will save Medicare from bankruptcy. We will reduce the size of this overbloated government that is taking away our freedoms.

Government has grown quite large. After World War II, we spent 12 percent of our GDP, our gross domestic product, for government spending. Now, we spend almost 22 percent of GDP. We have done this not by taxes, but by borrowing. We must balance the budget if we care about our kids and our grandkids having a good future.

TO PRESIDENT CHIRAC: STOP THE  
TESTING NOW

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. local time in Mururoa, the French Government exploded an underground nuclear weapon in the first of eight proposed tests that President Chirac contends are in France's vital national interests. It was also the 205th nuclear blast that France exploded, but yet they claim they still need more computer data.

Tuesday's explosion was detected by seismic monitoring stations as far as away as Australia, but France has yet to get the message. Testing half a world away from home displays an arrogance that is unbecoming of a civilized nation.

President Chirac has hinted that France may cut the testing program short. The gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA], our distinguished colleague, made his contribution by being detained by French test authorities last week.

President Chirac, listen to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA] and all peoples of the Pacific. Stop the testing now.

KEEP GOING

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, most of the Members of this House have spent the last few weeks traveling our districts and meeting with our constituents. In my town meetings, and in a very successful Medicare conference, my central coast California constituents seemed to be worried that this Congress will be bogged down and not complete the change we started the first 100 days.

They want Medicare to be safe for future generations. They know we must end failed spending policies. They know that we can and must balance the budget and give our children a future free of debt and full of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are on to something and my constituents understand that after 40 years of liberals defending the status quo, that the new majority of this Congress is changing the system that created the debt and rewarded inefficiency. They want solutions. They want action and they want it now.

CONGRATULATIONS TO CAL  
RIPKEN ON HIS 2,131ST CONSECUTIVE  
GAME

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the Members of this House, and all baseball fans around the Nation, let me offer our collective congratulations to Cal Ripken, Jr., of the Baltimore Orioles. Last night at Camden Yards in the Third Congressional District of Maryland, Cal played his 2,131st consecutive game, one more than the immortal Lou Gehrig, and did it with the same grace and dignity that has marked his remarkable career.

Mr. Speaker, there was not a dry eye in Camden Yards when Cal Ripken spoke after the game and gave credit to his family and the baseball fans for this remarkable accomplishment.

Thank you, Cal, for being such a great role model for young and old alike.

MEMBERS MUST FULFILL THEIR  
DUTIES

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, as I spent August back home with family and neighbors, I had time to reflect upon why I am here. It's easy to get caught up in inside-the-beltway activities and small battles and forget why our constituents sent us here.

I will tell Members why my constituents sent me here. They sent me here to balance the budget and scale back big Government. They sent me here to save and strengthen Medicare. They sent me here to change the destructive welfare system. And they sent me here

to relieve them of their overly heavy tax burden.

These are simple things. We can do this, and we should do this now. This was in our job description when we were sent here, and if we don't fulfill those duties, our employers will find someone who will.

MEDICARE'S PROBLEMS SHOULD  
BE SOLVED INDEPENDENT OF  
TAX CUTS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is quite telling on how excited my Republican colleagues get when democrats tell the truth about their plan to cut Medicare by \$270 billion. I am sure in their districts they got the same reaction that I got in mine when people learned that those cuts in Medicare were not going to be recycled to improve or extend the longevity of the Medicare Program, but rather much of that money was going to be taken away for the first time in history from the Medicare Program to pay for tax cuts for some of the wealthiest people in this country.

My constituents understood the need to make adjustments in Medicare. What they could not understand was a plan to raid that system, to make the problems worse, and for the first time in history take money away from Medicare for other purposes in terms of the budget.

Medicare ought to be solved within the Medicare system, independent of the drive to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy, to pay for tax cuts for the richest families in this country, while stealing the money from the elderly who need health care that they can afford.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, when I was home in my district last week, I met with constituents to get their input on Medicare. The most consistent question they had was, "Didn't Congress know about the Medicare problem last year or 2 years ago?" I said yes. But, they refused to confront it.

I urge my colleagues to listen to their constituents and listen to the professionals—the doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, and, of course, our seniors. We cannot propose a solution without their recommendations.

In my district, I have set up a task force to come up with some answers and help find the right solution. Let us not be so arrogant that we think we alone can solve this problem without seeking the advice of the people we represent.

My constituents realize that a 30-year-old Government program needs to

be reformed and brought into the 21st century. Politicians using scare tactics and acting like demagogues won't accomplish anything. Let's be responsible and confront the issue. And, solve it.

#### OPPOSITION TO THE DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Defense appropriations bill, especially given the priorities currently being established in Congress.

Now that the cold war is over, why do we continue to spend \$100 billion a year to defend Europe and Asia against a nonexistent enemy, while at the same time this Congress proposes major cut-backs in Medicare and Medicaid?

Why are we continuing to fund the absurd star wars program, but make disastrous cuts in student loans and education, the future of America?

Why are we expanding the B-2 program at over \$1 billion a plane, when the Pentagon has not even asked for any more planes, but we are cutting back on school nutrition programs and child care?

Why are we not cutting the CIA and the other intelligence programs now that the Soviet Union does not exist, but instead are cutting back on Head Start?

#### CONGRESS MUST BALANCE THE BUDGET AND STRENGTHEN MEDICARE

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks, after decades of fiscal irresponsibility, Congress will at last face up to its fundamental duty to balance the Federal budget. Not since 1969 have Federal expenses matched Federal revenues. Since then, we have compiled a national debt that bears down on our economy like a lead weight, the new Republican Congress is owning up to its commitment to balance the budget as a matter of moral obligation to future generations.

In addition, we are serious about saving the Medicare system. This is not a partisan issue—the President's own Cabinet Secretaries tell us the system is going bankrupt. Republicans find that unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, and our plan will strengthen and preserve Medicare for the sake of America's seniors.

Years ago, Ronald Reagan asked, "If not us, who? If not now, when?" Mr. Reagan's questions still resonate today. For the sake of our children and our parents, we will balance the budget and strengthen Medicare.

□ 1040

#### SUPPORT FOR U.N. CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN [CEDAW]

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today women from around the globe are meeting in Beijing.

The U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women, despite all of its problems, is turning out to be a testament to the will and determination of women who seek to create a better world for one-half of the world's population. Women today, in Beijing, are taking a stand for women.

Today, in these Chambers, I am asking my colleagues in the House of Representatives to take a stand for women. Today, I am introducing a resolution to urge the Senate to ratify the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, also known as CEDAW.

I hope that the next century will be the first century in the history of humanity where women are not faced with Government sanctioned discrimination. My resolution will be a step in that direction.

I look forward to the Congress of the United States approving my resolution.

#### WHY I SUPPORT THE B-2 PROGRAM

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the B-2 amendment. Like my colleagues I have taken a hard look at the B-2 program. In fact, I have gone out of my way to find a reason to vote against the B-2. I came to Washington to cut the deficit and eliminate wasteful programs. I voted against the space station because in my opinion the program did not make sense in the current budget environment.

The same cannot be said for the B-2. The truth is, that I have been unable to find a compelling reason to justify halting this program at 20 planes. The B-2, with its unprecedented combination of stealth, range, and payload is precisely the kind of technologically advanced weapon in which the Congress should invest.

A single B-2 has the ability to complete a mission that would require many more conventional aircraft. This in turn puts far fewer lives at risk. During the Gulf War the stealthy F-117 flew only 2 percent of the missions but hit 40 percent of the targets. The stealthy B-2 has a far greater capability than the F-117. We must keep our technological edge as we move toward the 21st century. The B-2 stealth bomber is the weapon that can meet future challenges.

#### REPUBLICANS' MEDICARE PLAN DOES NOT MAKE SENSE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Last month, Mr. Speaker, I listened to Ohioans in the 13th Congressional District in a town meeting in Newton Falls, at county fairs in Medina County, Portage County, at a supermarket in Sheffield Lake. People could not believe the Republicans' plan to cut \$270 million in Medicare and at the same time turn around and give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans of the same amount. I say to my colleagues, if you make \$300,000 a year, you save \$20,000 a year of your taxes under the Republican plan, while, as a Medicare beneficiary, it will cost you \$1,000 a year. If you are paying right now as a Medicare beneficiary a premium of about \$46 a month, under the Republican plan you will pay somewhere in the vicinity of \$110 a month.

Mr. Speaker, that extra \$60 or \$70 may not sound like much per month to a Member of Congress. But if my colleagues are making \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year, and they are retired, on Social Security, paying that extra several hundred dollars, \$700 or \$800 a year, for medical care is an absolute back breaker, and it does not make sense, Mr. Speaker, to make Medicare beneficiaries pay a thousand dollars more a year, all so they can give tax breaks to the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, it does not make sense.

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

Mr. BALLENGER. 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: the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

Mr. WISE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The Democrat leadership has been consulted and has no objections to these requests.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

**MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON S. 4, THE SEPARATE ENROLLMENT AND LINE-ITEM VETO ACT OF 1995**

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, and by direction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on Rules, I offer a privileged motion and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLINGER moves that the House insist on its amendment to the bill S. 4 and agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, on February 6 of this year the House passed H.R. 2, to give the President the line-item veto. The Senate followed suit in adopting S. 4, a separate enrollment version of item veto which was both considerably weaker than the House language and which posed substantial administrative burdens.

The disparity between our approaches was obvious, and so for the past several months Representatives of the House and Senate have been meeting informally to sort out the differences between our bills. The meetings have helped to identify areas for compromise and have focused attention on areas of remaining concern, such as the bills' target tax benefit language and en bloc voting provisions.

Because of these informal and bipartisan discussions, it now appears that agreement on the line-item veto is well within reach. House and Senate leaders have agreed that a formal conference is now warranted, and we are prepared to act. But to progress further and achieve a final agreement, the House must agree to a conference. My motion will allow us to move forward through a conference to resolve our few remaining differences and send to the President the bill he has been seeking—the strongest possible line-item veto.

I urge the motion's adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the privileged motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WISE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the

disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendments to the bill S. 4 be instructed to insist upon the inclusion of provisions within the scope of conference making the bill applicable to current and subsequent fiscal year appropriation measures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion on behalf of the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], and the other Democrats on the committee. I would hope that it would be noncontroversial.

Mr. Speaker, my motion does one thing and one thing only. It instructs the House conferees to insist upon an agreement giving the President line-item veto authority over current fiscal year appropriations, not just appropriations that are enacted after the enactment of the line-item veto. In other words, if my colleagues believe in the line-item veto, that they want it to apply as early as possible, that is the purpose of this motion to instruct.

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, pending that I would just indicate that, as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, we are pleased to accept the motion offered by the minority to instruct. The motion simply urges conferees to extend the full effect of the line-item veto to the President insofar as the scope of the conference will allow, and it is an eminently reasonable suggestion which fulfills the spirit of the line-item veto legislation.

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the report from my constituents during the month of August was very clear: Get on with the task of balancing the budget and downsizing government.

One tool that is going to be critical in the effort to reduce wasteful spending is the line-item veto. I have long supported a line-item veto for the President and have repeatedly introduced legislation to provide for this provision.

Both Houses have passed a line-item veto and it is time to go to conference and get this enacted into law.

I do not care whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat, we should give him a line-item veto, and we should do it now.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for yielding me half of his time. I applaud the chairman for the outstanding work that he and his committee have done to bring the line-item veto bill to this point, along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and other members of the Committee on Rules who have worked so diligently and so long on this very important issue. I agree with Chairman CLINGER that the gentleman's motion to instruct be accepted.

However, Mr. Speaker, it must not go unnoticed that we are at an historic moment right now, one which some of us have awaited for over 125 years. I recall 17 years ago when I came here with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] it was the first bill that I introduced in the Congress, and having waited all these years, it is going to be so gratifying to see this bill finally become law.

It is going to mean something to another person that I have such great respect for, and that is the man on whose birthday we passed this line-item veto back on February 6. His name is Ronald Wilson Reagan, one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever known, and, once this passes both bodies and is signed into law by the President, no one will be happier than that former great President.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my motion does one thing, and one thing only. It instructs the House conferees to insist upon an agreement giving the President line-item veto authority over current fiscal year appropriations, not just appropriations that are enacted after the enactment of the line-item veto.

At the outset, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for his support for my motion. Although we disagree over the need to give the President line-item veto authority at all, his willingness to give the President this authority over 1996 appropriations, if applicable, demonstrates his fairness and his commitment to the line-item veto as an instrument of fiscal policy.

In fact, the policy of the House-passed bills is to cover current year appropriations, and my motion simply ensures that this will continue to be the policy of the House. As a result of the passage of the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the President would have 10 days after the bill's date of enactment to line-item veto any unobligated funds from previously enacted appropriations for the current 1995 fiscal year.

My motion simply updates the intent of this amendment by instructing the conferees to make the line-item veto applicable to any current year appropriation, which may be fiscal year 1996 by the time the line-item veto conference is concluded.

The Obey amendment, which was adopted on February 3 of this year, received support from both sides of the aisle.

In accepting the amendment for the majority, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and manager of this bill, said "it is an excellent addition to what we are trying to do here, which is to get at those elements of pork, wherever they may exist and wherever they exist every year."

Some have suggested that after receiving publicity for passing the line-item veto, some Republican proponents of this legislation wanted to deny President Clinton use of the line-item veto against upcoming fiscal year appropriations which they have written.

Again, the debate from earlier this year makes it clear that this was not their stated intent at the time.

During the floor debate, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, and a manager of the bill, made this very clear and forceful statement, and I quote:

Well, here we are. We get a Democratic President, and here is Solomon up here fighting for the same line item veto for that Democratic President. I think this is something that a chief executive in government, regardless of political party, should have, just as 43 Governors of States have it. \* \* \*

The gentleman from New York went on to say, "I guess I have enough confidence in any President, regardless of political party, to use this new tool selectively and judiciously."

In his closing arguments, the Speaker also went out of his way to make it very clear that he had no interest in playing partisan politics with this issue. This is what the Speaker said at that time:

For those who think that this city has to always break down into partisanship, you have a Republican majority giving to a Democratic President this year without any gimmicks an increased power over spending, which we think is an important step for America, and therefore it is an important step on a bipartisan basis to do it for the President of the United States without regard to party or ideology.

The record is clear on both points. There was every intention to give the President line-item veto authority over current year appropriations, including those passed prior to the enactment of this bill, and not to deny the President this authority for partisan political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I personally do not support the line-item veto bill, but if it is

the answer to the country's spending problems that its proponents say it is, then this President should have it to deal with appropriations that may soon become law.

Once Congress cedes the line-item veto authority to a President, it is unlikely that it will every get it back. In the future, there will always be Presidents to whom the Congress may not want to give the line-item veto authority, but they will not have that choice. To deny the President line-item veto authority over fiscal year 1996 appropriations is to admit that the line-item veto is a mistake.

Today, I ask all proponents of this measure, to demonstrate again that their purpose is serious, fiscal reform. Vote for my motion to instruct the conferees to insist that the bill continue to apply to current appropriations, including, if applicable, those 1996 appropriations measures that soon will be enacted.

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to recognize the enormous role that the chairman of the Committee on Rules has played in this whole effort. As he said, starting 17 years ago he has been in the forefront of the effort to bring to fruition the line-item veto, and I commend him for his commitment to this goal over these many years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], another leader in this effort, who has done a superb job and, hopefully, will be a member of the conference and bring this thing home.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the House is taking action to provide the President an important tool necessary to reduce Government spending. As we move to go to conference on the line-item veto, we take a major step toward eliminating wasteful projects which are often buried in public laws without the benefit of public scrutiny.

On February 6 this House passed H.R. 2 by the overwhelming and bipartisan vote of 294 to 134. The Senate unfortunately disregarded that version and went on to pass a somewhat cumbersome line-item veto which would split larger bills into hundreds of pieces when they went to the President's desk.

Separate enrollment, as the other body calls its version, would create many problems, not the least of which would be giving the President writer's cramp from signing the thousands of bills Congress would be forced to send him.

The House, on the other hand, produced a strong, workable bill which preserves the balance of power between the legislative and executive branches while providing the President with more flexibility by allowing a reduction of spending items. I am confident

that in working together with the Senate we can come up with a fine compromise.

By the end of this fiscal year, the Federal debt is estimated to be more than \$4.9 trillion. In fact, appropriately on Friday, October 13, of this year, the Federal debt will reach the incredible level of \$5 trillion. That means a child born today is immediately saddled with an expense of more than \$187,000 over their lifetime just to pay the interest on their debt. While it will not in and of itself balance the budget, the line-item veto will be an important tool the President can use as this country moves toward that goal in 2002.

By moving forward on the line-item veto today, we are poised to deliver a long-overdue instrument of fiscal discipline not only to the President, but to the entire system of government here in Washington. Because we have kept our promise to swiftly maneuver the line-item veto through Congress, the days are numbered for wasteful projects rolled into omnibus spending bills.

This is truly an historic day because common sense is finally coming to our National Capital. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] for his tremendous leadership on this issue as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and many Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle who think this is a very, very important tool for the President to have.

□ 1100

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to go to conference and the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] to instruct conferees to H.R. 2, the line-item veto bill. I am pleased, frankly, that we are finally naming conferees, although I am disappointed that it has taken so long. I would like to give some credit to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], for prodding us to this point in the process.

Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago, February 6, the House passed H.R. 2; the Senate passed its version of the bill on March 23. We did it with great fanfare. In fact, the date that was chosen, February 6, was not fortuitous; it is the birthday of Ronald Reagan. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, said this was one of the proudest days of his life. The Republican leadership took particular pride in the fact that they were willing to give a Democratic President this substantial accession of power.

The Speaker himself said during the debate:

For those who think that this city always has to break down into partisanship, you have a Republican majority giving to a Democratic President this year without any gimmicks an increased power over spending.

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

A few years ago when we started pushing for this legislative line-item veto, there were a few doubting Democrats who said, "Solomon, it is easy for you to support the line-item veto when your party controls the White House, but we bet you will not be so gung ho when we have a Democratic President."

Well, here we are. We get a Democratic President, and here is the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] up here fighting for the same line-item veto for that Democratic President.

So in view of all of the fanfare, what has been the fate of this bill? Almost 150 days after the House and Senate have passed it in different versions, and significantly different versions, that is part of the problem, we are finally getting around to appointing conferees. What happened to the gung ho enthusiasm, to the bipartisan spirit? One has to wonder whether the Republican leadership is no longer so sure that it wants to give these broad powers to a Democratic President. One has to wonder whether they are concerned, afraid that this might give the President too much leverage during the upcoming budget battle. Whatever the reasons may be, I hope we can finally go back to that bipartisan spirit, that enthusiasm that was expressed on February 6.

Mr. Speaker, I still have constitutional questions about this bill. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows, every time we brought it up, I have been out here with an alternative that I think is a more workable alternative that would clearly pass constitutional review. However, I finally came around to voting for this, because I think it will help restore credibility in the congressional spending process if we give the President some additional power to cull out wasteful spending and to send it back here for final review.

Mr. Speaker, the question I am raising today is whether we are going to match our rhetoric with action today, and I hope the conferees will not just take their appointment, but move quickly to resolve differences between the House and Senate bill. I think we have to move to the House bill. I think the Senate has come up with an unworkable proposal as well as an unconstitutional proposal.

Let me take just one final moment to urge support for the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] and to commend the gentlewoman for bringing forward this particular motion. This should not be controversial. All they do is make clear that H.R. 2 applies to fiscal year 1996 spending bills, even if these bills become law before H.R. 2 is finally enacted.

As a result of the delay in passing H.R. 2, the item veto bill, it could be interpreted to exclude fiscal year 1996 spending measures from its coverage. It was never the intent of the House, I do not believe when we passed the bill, to exclude fiscal year 1996 spending bills. In fact, when H.R. 2 was considered by the House, we passed the Obey amendment. The Obey amendment gave the President the authority to veto items in fiscal year 1995 appropriation bills within 10 days after passage of H.R. 2, even if H.R. 2 was enacted.

So I do not think that the Collins amendment should be controversial. If we are true to our intent here, true to our purpose, we will make this part of the instruction, and I hope it will come back, the conference report itself, will come back with the Collins provisions incorporated.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to briefly thank both my former office neighbor, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], who is also a Chicago Bears fan along with me, and it looks like they were going to be coming back strong this year, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for quoting my previous remarks. Yes, I did back in 1979 support the line-item veto for a President called Jimmy Carter, and I supported it later on for a President called Ronald Wilson Reagan, and I supported it later on for a President called George Bush, and I still support it for a President called Bill Clinton, because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, that he wants us to get back on a bipartisan basis. We are doing that right here, because we are supporting the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS]. We want to make this bipartisan. I intend, as one of the conferees, to make sure that we are going to lean toward the House-passed bill, because much of what the gentleman from South Carolina said is true: There are constitutional problems with the Senate version. Plus, from a practical point of view, it is just totally unworkable, if we are going to have a real meaningful line-item veto that a President can use effectively.

So I look forward to working with those Members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and others who will be conferees to make sure that we get a meaningful line-item veto finally, once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], another leader on this issue and one of the most fiscally responsible Members of this body, a member of the Committee on Rules, who has led the fight for fiscal responsibility since the day he set foot on this floor.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise obviously in very strong support of the House-passed version of the line-item veto. I would point out that taking this up today as we start out the fall session is a promise kept. We said we would do it, we are doing it. I certainly commend the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] for carrying her motion to resolution which we agree with, as we have said, to instruct conferees. I think it is a useful addition.

I would point out that by a vote of 294 to 134 in early February, this House acted, I think, very decisively to grant line-item veto authority to the President. We really are committed to establishing this tool to root out unnecessary or wasteful spending where we can identify it, and we can, and unfair tax breaks as well, where we can identify them. Our colleagues in the other body obviously have come up with a markedly different approach to the line-item veto, as we all know, their so-called separate enrollment process, and I frankly think that is a very cumbersome and complex process, and I do not think it can be effective, but we will discuss that in conference. We are going to have our work cut out for us over there.

Preliminary discussions, however, make me a little optimistic that we are going to be able to make some progress. I think we are beginning to see some wisdom from people on the other side in understanding our position on this and why we think it is going to work better.

I commend particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for their efforts of really keeping this on the front burner as we have gone along, even at a time, frankly, when some thought the differences between the House and the other body were going to be too great to overcome. We are back at it, and I think that is right where we should be.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct conferees reflects a spirit of bipartisan cooperation, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has just reiterated, by urging the conference to move expeditiously so that the line-item veto can begin to work as soon as possible on appropriations measures. This language restates our commitment to implementing the line-item veto expeditiously, as we have promised we would do.

I was down in the district as we all were on this recent break, and I can count on two questions coming up any time I get a gathering of more than two or three people in my district. One of those questions is where is the line-

item veto, the other question by them is what about the notch.

Mr. Speaker, let us today support this motion and get on with our work in conference.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding, and I rise frankly just to suggest to my colleagues a word of caution that I raised with my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], 17 years ago when we were freshmen, about this matter. I agree very strongly with those who are concerned about our deficit and the importance of moving toward a balanced budget.

Having said that, I feel very strongly about local government and State running a lot more than the Federal Government, but there are reasons to have a Federal Government, including our national defense. From time to time in the history of this country we have tended to be penny-wise and pound-foolish in that area. As peace looms on the horizon, many an administration becomes very cautious about spending money in this area. I would rue the day that a President, for example, chose to use the line-item veto to strike the B-2, for example, so critical to our future ability to project peace in the world. So a word of caution, my friends, as we move forward with the streamroller that seems to be heading toward either a direct line or a cliff.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion, and I compliment the gentlewoman from Illinois for putting forth this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that this body get on with the work that the American people want us to do, and that is to accomplish the line-item veto legislation. When this legislation was first introduced in January, and it is a piece of legislation that I have supported both in this Congress and in the last Congress, I cautioned my constituents, saying that I feared what we would see is we would see quick action in the House, perhaps separate action by the Senate, and then there would be serious delay in getting the two bodies together, and unfortunately that is clearly what has happened up to this point.

But now it is time for us to get to work. Let us do the work that the American people want us to do, let us sit down as conferees, get the differences between the two houses ironed out and give the President the authority to get rid of pork barrel spending and special interest tax breaks.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just this moment to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Government Re-

form and Oversight, the chairman, for his assistance in this matter and for the spirit of cooperation that he has always dealt with the minority on this particular matter. He has done so repeatedly, and he has always been there to discuss these very important issues with us.

I want to also thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules who, I am glad to say, is still a very avid fan of the Chicago Bears and, along with him, I too hope that we are successful this term.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois, the ranking member. We may not always agree, but we are always very civil and she has always been very cooperative in accomplishing what needs to be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out again that this measure did have broad bipartisan support when it came before the House in February. I am pleased that we come out of this motion today again united, with bipartisan support, in moving forward and trying to address the issues with the other body.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees, which seeks to apply line-item veto legislation to all fiscal year 1996 spending bills.

I am pleased to see House leadership appoint conferees today for H.R. 2, the line-item veto legislation. This move is long overdue. On February 6, the House approved H.R. 2, the line-item veto bill, by the overwhelming majority of 294 to 134. Line-item veto was a key component of the Contract With America. The Senate passed a line-item veto bill in March. However, it is almost 6 months later, and we are finally getting around to appointing conferees.

As a strong supporter of line-item veto, I became increasingly distressed this summer to hear statements from leadership that line-item veto was dead for the year. In an effort to increase pressure to revive this bill this year, I attempted to offer an amendment to each of the five remaining appropriations bills to apply the provisions of H.R. 2 to those individual appropriations bills. My concern was that even if we passed line-item veto this year, a delayed agreement would mean that over \$500 billion in fiscal year 1996 spending would not be subject to line-item veto.

When I was denied the opportunity to offer this amendment, I then introduced a House resolution on the last day before recess calling on House leadership to appoint conferees. This resolution was cosponsored by 66 Members of the House. My resolution also stated the sense of the House that we should not send appropriations conference reports to the President unless we took steps to apply line-item veto to such conference reports.

The motion to instruct conferees goes to the heart of this issue. The motion instructs conferees to insist that line-item veto be applicable to any current or subsequent fiscal year appropriations bills—which would include all 1996 spending bills. It is my understanding

that leadership will accept this motion. I applaud this constructive move, and again, support the action we are taking today to begin the conference process on line-item veto.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge that finding an agreement between the House and Senate will not be an easy chore. While there is a clear majority in both the House and Senate in favor of some form of line-item veto or enhanced rescission, there are honest disagreements over the best form of such legislation.

However, I have never understood why the potential difficulty of reaching agreement should prevent us from even trying. That is why I have pushed so hard to begin the process. It is my hope that we can move expeditiously to reach an agreement and send a line-item veto bill to the President for his signature into law.

However, the appointment of conferees and the motion to instruct still provide no assurance that line-item veto will apply to 1996 spending bills. Therefore, I reiterate my call to apply line-item veto provisions to each spending bill that we send to the President this year—and to urge that we make every effort to make sure that every dollar of discretionary spending is subject to the fiscal scrutiny of Presidential authority to veto individual items of pork barrel or unnecessary spending. If we can do so, we can help restore taxpayer faith that their tax dollars are spent wisely.

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CLINGER, SOLOMON, BUNNING, DREIER, BLUTE, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois and Mr. SABO and Mr. BEILENSON.

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2126, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further

consideration of the bill H.R. 2126 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 205 shall also be governed by the following order:

Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the following amendments—identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII—each of which may be considered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member—or one of the Members—specified, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, may amend portions of the bill previously amended, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall not otherwise be in order during further consideration of the bill for amendment: One of the amendments numbered 10, 11, 18, 34, or 56, by Representative KASICH or Representative OBEY, to be debatable for 60 minutes, with 10 minutes controlled by Representative KASICH, 10 minutes controlled by Representative DELLUMS, 10 minutes controlled by Representative OBEY, 15 minutes controlled by Representative DICKS, and 15 minutes controlled by Representative YOUNG of Florida; one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 61, by Representative OBEY, to be debatable in the aggregate for not more than 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and one of the amendments numbered 3 or 15, by Representative DORNAN, together with the amendment numbered 48 as a substitute therefor, by Representative DELAURO, to be jointly debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representatives DORNAN and DELAURO.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 205 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2126.

□ 1116

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. SENSENBRENNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 31, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] had been disposed of and title III was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the bill for amendment in Committee of the Whole may not exceed 5 hours, exclusive of time consumed by recorded votes and proceedings incidental thereto.

Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the following amendments—identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII—each of which may be considered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member—or one of the Members—specified, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, may amend portions of the bill previously amended, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall not otherwise be in order during further consideration of the bill for amendment: One of the amendments numbered 10, 11, 18, 34, or 56, by Representative KASICH or Representative OBEY, to be debatable for 60 minutes, with 10 minutes controlled by Representative KASICH, 10 minutes controlled by Representative DELLUMS, 10 minutes controlled by Representative OBEY, 15 minutes controlled by Representative DICKS, and 15 minutes controlled by Representative YOUNG of Florida; one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 61, by Representative OBEY, to be debatable in the aggregate for not more than 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and one of the amendments numbered 3 or 15, by Representative DORNAN, together with the amendment numbered 48 as a substitute therefor, by Representative DELAURO, to be jointly debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Representatives DORNAN and DELAURO.

Are there any amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

Mr. KASICH. 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. KASICH: Page 23, line 17, strike "\$7,162,603,000" and insert "\$6,669,603,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement previously agreed to, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be rec-

ognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Well, we have been through this so many times now, it is kind of hard to bring additional facts to the table, but it seems as though every day we turn around in regard to the B-2 bomber there is another interesting development.

In this morning's Wall Street Journal, the head of the Air Force procurement program, the Air Force general in charge of the procurement programs for the Air Force, so Members of Congress, if you are concerned about the C-17, if you are concerned about any of the acquisition programs of the Air Force, General Muellner, said despite the wishes of many in Congress, quote, the Air Force cannot afford to buy more than 20 B-2 stealth bombers. The bottom line is the budget will not support it, he said. I really believe that.

I mean when we have no one in the Pentagon that wants this airplane, when we have the General Accounting Office talking about the performance problems and performance issues associated with the aircraft, when the cost of the airplane is not affordable, and I ask Members how they can go home and defend the billion dollar airplane while at the same time we are trying to squeeze savings out of this Federal budget, and at a time when the mission of this airplane, which was to invade the Soviet Union in the middle of the nuclear war is over, how the heck can we go forward and tell the Pentagon to buy more?

I will say to my Republican colleagues one of the criticisms that many I have encountered over the break is how is it that we want to squeeze down funding for certain programs but yet we want the Pentagon to spend \$7 billion more than what they have asked for. Now, some people say that generals do not tell the truth any more, that they are all political. Well, it is interesting, in the last administration the generals' words were good. Now the generals are all political.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit to Members that as one who has questioned aggressively the brass in the Pentagon and the civilians in the Pentagon, I have never yet seen the Pentagon come to Capitol Hill and ask for less spending. It blows my mind that the Pentagon could come and ask for less spending and we keep telling them we know better.

When the general in charge of acquisition for all the major weapon systems for the Air Force says we do not want the plane, we cannot afford the plane, folks, it is time to come to the floor and make a big chop out of the stack of wood labeled corporate welfare and adopt this amendment and abide by the

agreement we made several years ago to limit this plane at 20.

The issue that if you have the B-2 you will not need these other planes to carry out the mission is an argument that is also beyond my understanding for this reason. No one is suggesting we retire the F-15's or the F-16's. No one is suggesting that that whole list of aircraft that are supposed to be used will not be used or be retired. In fact, there are additional costs associated with the B-2, including the cost of forward funding, protecting the planes, additional tankers.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact of the matter is, in a nutshell, and it is kind of hard to lay much more out there, if the guys in the Pentagon, if the guys in the field who are running the military of the United States do not want this plane, if the Pentagon does not want it, if the mission has evaporated, if we are in tough budget times, now is the time to live up to the deal and limit the acquisition to 20. Support the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to speak against the amendment. On January 4, 1995, seven former Secretaries of Defense, Mel Laird, Jim Schlesinger, Donald Rumsfeld, Harold Brown, Caspar Weinberger, Frank Carlucci, and Dick Cheney wrote the President of the United States a letter and said in their experience that stopping the B-2 at 20 was a serious mistake in judgment.

I think those seven former Secretaries of Defense, six of which were Republicans, and Harold Brown, who was the man who started this program, should be given serious consideration by this Congress. This line is open now. If we could procure the planes now, we can save the taxpayers a considerable amount of money.

Mr. Chairman, this is the most important defense issue that we are going to consider in this decade. The F-117 stealth attack aircraft worked effectively in the gulf. It showed that we could operate autonomously without support aircraft. The B-2 is a bigger and better version of that aircraft.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes and 30 seconds.

Members, I find this whole debate absolutely mind boggling. For the last month, the Congress has passed appropriation bill after appropriation bill and we have cut education, we have cut student loans, we have cut low-income heating assistance programs for poverty-ridden senior citizens, we have cut science budgets, we have cut virally everything you can think of on the domestic side of the ledger, and yet some of the same people who enthusiastically embraced those cuts are now saying, oh, but we have to have more spending on this turkey of a B-2 bomber.

We are now being asked to spend money to buy more B-2's than the Pentagon itself is asking for, more than the President is asking for, and we are

told that because some former Secretaries of Defense would like us to buy some of these toys, that we ought to do it. I would suggest the right people to ask are not former Secretaries of Defense but the former Directors of the Office of Management and Budget, because I will bet you, if you ask any of them, they will tell you that we simply cannot afford this plane, either militarily or fiscally.

Now, we can get into all of the discussions we want about whether or not this money would be better spent on the domestic side of the ledger than the defense side of the ledger. Let us say it is not going to be. I would submit that we still have to face the fact, and this Congress must face the fact, that we cannot afford to buy the items that we are already promising to buy in the Pentagon budget. We cannot afford to buy the items that we are listing in the Pentagon budget unless we eliminate the additional purchases of the B-2 plus one other major weapon system at least.

Mr. Chairman, while in the near years, the congressional Republican budget would be higher than the President's budget on defense, after 7 years this budget is lower than the President's budget, and we simply do not have the room in the defense budget to buy every little item we would like to buy.

□ 1130

I just want to put this in context for those who think we can afford this. We have some tough choices we have to make. The cost of one of these bombers would pay for the cost of tuition for every single student at the University of Wisconsin for the next 11 years. That is all. The cost of these bombers, which is highly disputable to begin with, because we have three different estimates of what they are likely to cost, but no matter how we slice it, we cannot afford the cost when measured against domestic priorities, we cannot afford the cost when measured against other military priorities, and we ought to pass this amendment and turn down this ridiculous spending today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to express my deep appreciation to my colleagues who have worked so hard on this matter, a very critical issue to America's future ability to not just defend itself, but to represent freedom and peace in the free world. I especially want to stress my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from California [BUCK MCKEON] who has taken the lead on this work from our perspective, and has done a fantastic job of finding out where the votes really are.

The issue before us will close the B-2 line forever, Mr. Chairman. That is

the heart of my concern. I strongly oppose this effort. The advent of stealth has revolutionized the way we think about air warfare, an important facet of our Nation's defense. The B-2 is far and away the most advanced weapon system this world has ever seen. The value of this new stealth capability was evident in the gulf war with the F-117. The F-117 production line is already closed. The B-2 bomber takes this technology one major step further.

The B-2 can fly six times farther than the F-117, carry eight times more precision payload, and destroys targets with greater accuracy than any other aircraft that the world has ever seen. For example, a force with 30 B-2's loaded with modern weapons could have engaged as many targets on the first day of the Persian Gulf war as the 1,263 aircraft that were used. This is an amazing fact. The B-2 will save lives as well as money. It will conserve resources in the long run and will create a capability that the U.S. military forces alone will have, and that we desperately will need.

This body has always followed the philosophy that U.S. soldiers, sailors, and airmen must be sent in harm's way fully prepared and equipped for victory. Now is not the time to reverse that philosophy. The citizens of our Nation will not stand for more Scott O'Grady's.

As we continue to close bases around the world, we need the power projection which the B-2 gives us. The B-2 can be almost anywhere in the world in 12 hours.

Several opponents have cited a severely flawed GAO study, stating that the B-2 can't operate in a rainstorm or is not as stealthy as reported. I was pleased to see Secretary Kaminski strongly refute each point in that study. We heard that the draft was not even reviewed by the GAO's chief scientist before it was leaked to the press.

Secretary Kaminski stated in his rebuttal:

The radar is performing in rain as expected during this stage of its development. There is no indication that the radar's performance while flying through rain will not fully meet requirements.

Testing to date has not identified any areas that will prevent the B-2 from meeting its operational stealth requirements.

The detectability and survivability testing completed to date has been entirely successful in confirming expected B-2 performance.

Even General Horner who was in charge of air operations during the Persian Gulf war states that the "delivered B-2 aircraft have demonstrated, without qualification, that the B-2 is a superb weapon system—performing even better than expected."

As a member of the Intelligence Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles Defense, I could never in good conscience vote to close the only bomber production line in this country, especially one as advanced as the B-2.

Proponents of this amendment state that we can't afford to keep the only bomber production line in this Nation open. Let me assure you, for our sons and daughters, our grandchildren and great-grandchildren, for pilots like Scott O'Grady, we can't afford not to. Vote "no" on the Obey-Dellums-Kasich amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, let us look at the cold hard facts.

The budget resolution conference report contains significantly less money for defense than the House Defense authorization bill that was passed earlier. The House appropriations ceiling for defense has since been adjusted accordingly. The result is that the B-2 is now even less affordable.

Simply put, the enormous outyear "tail" of the B-2 was not budgeted to begin with, and now there is even less money than was believed available at the time of the B-2 authorization vote. The fiscal arguments against the B-2 are now stronger than ever.

The results of the heavy bomber industrial capabilities study have been released. It contradicts assertions that new B-2's are needed to keep a bomber industrial base alive. The study states that, first, there is no distinct bomber industry and that bomber production efficiently shifts between prime contractors over the years, and second, a restart of the production line, if necessary, would not be costly nor present any technical difficulty.

Finally, the General Accounting Office has completed a report on the current status of the B-2 cost, development, and production efforts which is highly critical of the program.

The report states the aircraft has not passed most of its basic tests, is not as "stealthy" as advertised, and its new, next-generation terrain following/terrain avoidance radar cannot distinguish the difference between a rain cloud and a mountain. Furthermore, the GAO warns of persistent technical and production problems that will directly translate into cost growth. Indeed, B-2 proponents found it necessary to write into the Defense authorization bill a repeal of the cost cap—a cap of \$44.4 billion on the original 20 aircraft.

The case against additional procurement is clear. Support sound fiscal policy. Support sound defense spending. Support the Kasich amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my classmate and good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. IKE SKELTON, one of the truly outstanding defense experts in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I speak today to keep this House of Representatives from making a mistake. This House made a mistake in the past. In 1939 it sent a message when it failed to spend those dollars necessary to upgrade the harbor at Guam, telling the Japanese Empire that we would not defend the Pacific.

If we turn down additional B-2's and adopt this amendment, we will be sending a message that deterrence does not count. We will be sending a message that we will not take the best advantage of our technological superiority and put it into the defense of our wonderful Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. Today's debate will shape the future not only of our United States Air Force, but of our national defense. It is a debate affecting American air doctrine and a debate about our ability to meet the basic requirements of our national military strategy. Additional B-2's are important for modernizing our aging fleet, and it is aging; maintaining our technological edge, for which America has always been in the forefront; and maintaining within the Air Force an ability to project force against an enemy from a great distance.

Our Nation's strategic position is unique. The national military strategy requires our Armed Forces to prepare for nearly two simultaneous major regional contingencies, and we should keep in mind that we came within a gnat's eyelash, a gnat's eyelash, of conflict three times last year: in Haiti, in North Korea, and again with Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Chairman, an effective long range bomber force is essential to meet the requirements of our strategy. We must continue this line. Over the past 70 years, air power has lifted from our soldiers and sailors the burden of maintaining peace, alone; this is an additional weapons system of deterrence.

The gulf war ushered in a new chapter of air power. As the deep strike mission complemented our air forces at sea and on the ground, a new level of performance was reached. In the first 48 hours of Desert Storm, American air power crippled Iraqi air defense, wrecked major command centers, destroyed military communications, prevented Saddam Hussein from broadcasting by radio or television. This was done by the stealth technology. What this B-2 does is add stealth technology to long-range capability. It is a necessary step for our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], as manager of the bill, has the right to close on this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I note the applause for the last speaker, and I certainly share the House's affection for him, but let us stop the hyperbole and look at the realities. We are told by the last speaker that if we do not fund the B-2 that we are not interested in deterrence. What a line of baloney. What a line of baloney.

This chart demonstrates what has happened to Russian military budgets, in red, since 1989 versus what has happened to the United States defense budget. As we can see in the blue, the United States budget has dropped in minor ways. The former Soviet Union budget has dropped precipitously. The Russian military budget has been cut by some 70 percent. As we can see, the U.S. military budget cuts are markedly less than that. So much for the idea that we are not engaging in deterrence.

People will say, "Well, but you have some of those rogue states out there.

We have to be prepared to deal with them." OK. Let us take a look at the potential enemies list. If we take a look at what the United States spends as a portion of the world's military budget, and then if we take a look at what all of the rogue states spend—down here on the chart—excluding for the moment China and Russia, we have the lion's share of military expenditures in comparison to that tiny little sliver for the rogue states, and if we add into it every dime being spent by China or by Russia, it demonstrates that the United States still has overwhelming superiority, not just in military quality but in military budgets.

These two charts would show the United States dominance in terms of military spending and would show a clear and substantial excess of United States defense spending over Russian spending. To argue that that demonstrates that we are not providing military deterrence is patently laughable. If we want to argue the specifics of the B-2, go ahead, but do not for 1 minute suggest that the United States security is threatened by not buying that flying turkey. The only thing that is threatened are the corporate budgets of the people who build that plane.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of really dollars; it is do we want to defend this country or do we not? The question is, do we want an aircraft that is capable, or do we not? The B-52, which they say can be extended way out there, cannot be. That airplane helped get me out of Vietnam when I came within 2,500 feet of us, scared the Vietnamese to death, and ended the war. However, they are old.

I got a chance to fly one at Seymour Johnson in Goldsboro, NC, when I came back from the very outfit that had bombed Hanoi, and I will tell the Members, when I flew that airplane it scared me to death, because I looked at it and the skin is all wrinkled, the airplane is old. They are hard to maintain. You did not know if they are hard to maintain. You did not know if they were going to fly. Just recently, this picture illustrates what happened to one of our B-52's. Members may have read about it in the paper. Two of the engines fell off of the thing. That is how old they are. Not only that, but they damaged the wing, which we can see there on the left, and damaged one of the other engines. They could not even jettison their fuel, which newer aircraft can. They could not land immediately. They had to fly around until they got some of their fuel out in a bad airplane.

You are asking us to extend the life of this aircraft 30 more years. That is absolutely ludicrous, asking our military to fly in a piece of junk, and that is about what the B-52's are today. For 30 more years, risking the lives of our

men, our servicemen, is against the will of the Nation, I believe.

It is time to buy new aircraft and it is time to keep the B-2 line open. It is a superb airplane. It can do the job. It has been proven that it gives our military and added capability that is immeasurable, and it is a program we cannot do without.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], one of our leaders.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The B-2 is an essential component of our overall national defense capability. We live in an increasingly dangerous world, and a significant bomber capability is needed to ensure military preparedness and to protect our national interests.

The events of the last few years since the wall came down in Berlin and the Soviet empire began crumbling have vividly demonstrated that the world continues to be one where hazards abound. The Persian Gulf war certainly emphasized the point that the U.S. can never let down her guard, and that threats to our security interests may pop up at any time throughout the world.

The B-2 is an incredibly powerful and effective aircraft. Just one B-2 plane is needed to carry out a military mission that would normally require an entire squadron of planes. Thus, for a given military operation, only 2 pilots' lives will be put at risk when the B-2 bomber is used.

It's imperative that we maintain all aspects of our military readiness in order to respond to threats. And maintaining readiness requires that we continue to modernize our bomber fleet with the best, most up-to-date equipment we can. The B-2 is a quality aircraft that provides stealthiness, long-range flying capability, and the ability to deliver large payments, on target.

Mr. Chairman, the B-2 provides our Nation with important security. I urge my colleagues to reject the Kasich amendment, and support the B-2 bomber.

□ 1145

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the chairman of the Democratic Caucus in the House of Representatives and one of the most knowledgeable Members on defense matters in this House.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, despite the comments of my colleague from New York, let me proceed briefly in opposition to the Dellums-Kasich amendment.

I rise in opposition to the Dellums-Kasich amendment to the Defense appropriations bill, and I urge my col-

leagues to support continued long-lead funding for the B-2 stealth bomber.

We live in uncertain times. Although we cannot predict the course of international events, we can ensure that we have, at our disposal, the resources to protect our vital, national security interests.

Recent events in Bosnia provide just one example of our continued need to maintain a flexible, advanced fighting force.

The B-2 stealth bomber is an integral component of the fighting force of the future. It is the tactical component of our commitment to military readiness.

But it is more than that. With the aid of a revolutionary design, the B-2 is ready to strike for freedom at a moment's notice, across vast distances, with deadly accuracy.

As we bring our troops home from forward bases overseas, we are compelled to consider our ability to initiate military operations from American soil. The B-2's long-range capabilities make this necessity a reality.

While evading the world's most advanced air defense systems, the B-2 can hit its targets with precision, and return safely home.

Most importantly, our mission can be accomplished without placing the lives of tens of thousands of U.S. soldiers in jeopardy.

The B-2 allows us to react quickly, and with resolve, to regional or multi-regional conflicts around the globe.

From a technical standpoint, the B-2 represents an unparalleled achievement.

In the past, we augmented our fighting forces with a entire battalion of escorts, radar jammers, and suppressors.

"The B-2," according to former Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Merrill A. McPeak, "offers a much more satisfying and elegant solution: avoid detection, and tip the scales back in favor of flexibility and offensive punch."

In light of our renewed commitment to fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction, some have questioned our ability to continue investing in this program. We are right to reassess our priorities, and subject the defense budget to the same careful scrutiny we bring to other segments of the Federal budget.

But, for the sake of short-term fiscal expediency, we should not sacrifice our long-term national security interests. The B-2 program is the capstone of a \$45 billion investment.

If we back down now, we will undercut this Nation's advanced technology base and risk tying our hands in the event of future conflict.

I would also like to point out that the B-2 represents a way for us to leverage our resources. Just one B-2 can pack the same punch as a much larger conventional force—some estimates suggest a force as large as 75 aircraft.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I realize that while Republicans continue to make devastating cuts in education and other important programs, it is difficult to support more B-2's.

But I caution my colleagues to remember that if the B-2 is defeated, that will only mean more wasted money on Star Wars and larger unwarranted defense budgets in the future.

So, I would ask my colleagues to support the B-2 and defeat the Dellums-Kasich amendment.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, there have been two major studies, one by Rand and one by Jasper Welch. I even asked Colin Powell, "What did you recommend to Dick Cheney?" He answered 50. The numbers in the two studies are somewhere between 40 and 60 B-2's are what are required to give our Nation a deterrent force for the next 30 years.

The idea that we are going to rely on planes that are today on the average 35 years old I think is a serious mistake in judgment. Stealth is a revolutionary technology. When combined with precision-guided munitions and its range, it gives us a whole new kind of capability.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, today we will hear a lot of facts and figures from proponents and opponents of the B-2 program. However, I believe that we should look back in history when we consider whether to continue production of the B-2.

Let me first go back 3 months ago when Capt. Scott O'Grady was shot down in a mission over Bosnia. As we remember, our whole Nation was focused on the fate of this young pilot, and we did not even know his name or anything else about him at the time.

The fact today is that the American people are unwilling to accept large war casualties, and I support them in that. In order to minimize American casualties, we need to ensure that our military forces are equipped with the means necessary to defend U.S. interests in an environment where many nations possess deadly offensive weapons.

Let me go back a little further in history. Every time, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] pointed out, that we have redirected defense spending to nondefense programs, we have had to eventually build up our military forces. I realize this money for the B-2 can be used on a number of other programs but can proponents of those other programs guarantee to me, to this body and to the American people that the United States will not need a bomber force in the future?

We have 15 years invested in this and over \$40 billion, and now when they can build the planes cheaper, when the production line is there, we are talking about cutting it. That just does not

make sense. I do not think that they can guarantee that, and the real issue is, if B-2 production is capped, our ability to produce modern bomber aircraft will vanish quickly. History has demonstrated that it will again be necessary to produce these aircraft, which will then require a massive expenditure in the future.

I have been to the floor. I have seen where these planes are made. I have talked to the people that are building these planes. To lose this capability and this ability is something that we should not even be talking about here today. It is important for us for our future. I urge support of this bill and opposition to the Obey-Dellums-Kasich amendment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement. He has become one of the most knowledgeable Members about the B-2.

There is one other item that I would like to mention. B-2's and F-117's save American lives. When we send a bomber or that F-117 in harm's way, they are going to come back because they are stealthy.

Captain O'Grady got shot down in an F-16, and the French Mirage was shot down. Why? Because they are not stealthy airplanes. We in this Congress have a responsibility to put the young men and women serving in our military in the best airplanes we have got.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a distinguished member of both the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, let me first congratulate Chairman YOUNG and the ranking member, Mr. MURTHA, for writing a responsible spending bill that improves quality of life for our troops, but recognizes that we must pick carefully among competing programs to select those that yield the best results for our national security interests. Our resources are not unlimited, and this bill acknowledges that reality.

It is in that spirit that I rise in support of the Kasich amendment to eliminate funding earmarked for production of additional B-2 bombers. Set aside the fact that Air Force Chief of Staff, General Fogleman, has concerns about the fiscal ramifications of producing more B-2's. And set aside the DOD commissioned study by the Analytical Sciences Corp. that concluded that the United States does not need to keep producing Stealth bombers to preserve bomber-manufacturing capabilities. But do not set aside the basic issue—and that is status of our strategic nuclear force structure and our ability to project nuclear force. That is the proper focus of this debate.

Our nuclear triad depends not just on the B-2, of which we will have 20 by fiscal year 2000, but on our *Ohio*-class strategic submarines, land-based ICBM's, and B-52 bombers. Will our nuclear posture crumble without addi-

tional B-2 procurement? The answer is clearly, decisively, "no."

This is a time we are making difficult choices in all Federal agencies and programs. We must also look to our defense establishment for budgetary savings—but only when it is entirely consistent with our national security interests. Military leadership has told Congress that additional procurement of the B-2 is a luxury we cannot afford in future fiscal years, I am not willing to sacrifice other badly needed weapons systems which will become available in future years, nor sacrifice continued readiness on the altar of additional B-2 procurement.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich amendment, and I want to respond to some of the arguments that have been made.

The statement has been made that we are cutting everything else except defense. Well, I think the American people want us to find budget savings. I think they want us to balance the budget. We spend a lot of money on worthwhile projects in this Federal Government, but not all of them are absolutely essential to our survival as a nation.

National defense, on the other hand, is a constitutional responsibility that only the Federal Government has. Providing for the common defense is right there in the preamble to the Constitution, and if the U.S. Congress does not provide those funds, they will not be provided by anyone else.

When 7 former Secretaries of Defense write to the President of the U.S. and say that the B-2 bomber is central to meeting the challenge to U.S. security over the next decades, then we as a Congress ought to sit up and take notice of that.

I urge Members to defeat the Kasich amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, yielding me the time.

The gentleman from Ohio has asked how we can defend spending money on the B-2's. It is very simple. The B-52's are 35 years old now. We have to plan for the threat 30 years out. They will be 65, 70 years old by the time a far envelope threat might arise.

The 117's did a great job. They were stealthy. They worked in Desert

Storm. But they are fighter planes. They cannot deliver the munitions. The B-1's are not stealthy. They cannot perform the mission of the B-2's.

The B-2's can perform, they can be there, they can project American power anywhere in the world from the continental United States. They do not have to be based all over the world. We have pulled back our troops, we have pulled back our Navy, we have pulled back our Air Force. We are becoming more and more isolated and internalized. The B-2's can project power, awesome power, quickly and silently and deadly, in the areas to which we might need to project American presence in the future.

It is silly to cut off our own hands at this time. We should not do it. We will not be able to project that force if we do not continue the line on the B-2's. I urge defeat of the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a letter from General Horner.

SHALIMAR, FL, August 23, 1995.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This year, as we celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II, I am struck by the similarities between the challenges America faced fifty years ago, and those we face today.

Having just won a great and very costly victory, the nation rushed to demobilize and draw down its armed forces. But our relief was short-lived and we soon faced a new, largely undefined military threat. The post cold war draw down of our military forces has been accomplished in like fashion—without sufficient critical debate.

Today, some argue that the international environment allows us to safely abandon military forces in favor of other investments. While this is not an unfamiliar argument, others suspect that we have already gone too far in dismantling our defenses. They are wary of our hasty reductions, for they remember Korea well and how America paid for its lack of military strength with the lives of our men and women. And they remember Desert Storm, where our well trained and properly equipped forces brought a swift victory with a minimum of casualties.

We are now searching for a new national security policy—much as we did after World War II. It took years to define the Containment and Deterrence policies that dictated our decisions about building military forces and led the Free World safely through a forty year struggle. The radical change in the world security environment since the end of the cold war, has been accompanied with an equal change in military affairs. The world has become uncertain, even more dangerous as the nuclear secrets, which the superpowers guarded so carefully in the past are bought, stolen or discovered by an alarming number of nations around the globe.

The revolution in military affairs created by new technologies was displayed over Iraq in 1991. Surveillance of the battlefield by AWACS, Joint STARS, and satellites is now augmented by a host of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. The computing power needed to make sense of all the information being gathered is rapidly growing, decreasing in cost, and increasing in availability. The newest Joint STARS aircraft uses commercial computers giving it eight times the power at lower cost than the ones used in Desert

Storm. All of this is now coupled with communications of astounding capacity. This means we know more, are able to make better decisions, and implement them in seconds rather than days as required in the past.

So what good is all of this surveillance, computing and communications if you can't hit the target? That's the other lesson of the Gulf War—the importance of stealth and precision guided munitions in modern warfare. There is no doubt about the potential offered by stealth, precision guided munitions and information technologies. We must build a force with these capabilities and that is precisely why we need B-2 bombers.

In battle, commanders will know where they need to strike rapidly and accurately to speed victory and protect American lives. The B-2 provides that capability. It can hit targets anywhere throughout the region of conflict with low cost weapons and survive. We saw how the O'Grady shot down in Bosnia drove our air power out of the area until we deployed aircraft to jam and attack ground-based radar and anti-aircraft missiles. The B-2 will not have to wait until a protective armada of support aircraft suppresses enemy air defenses. It carries programmable precision munitions costing significantly less than the long range stand-off weapons carried by other platforms. Because the B-2 can safely release its weapons over the target, its munitions don't need the guidance and propulsion system used by costly standoff weapons to achieve the same level of safety for our military forces. Cost of munitions is important. In fact, during the Gulf War, we were told to quit using the Tomahawk stand-off missile because it was too expensive—over a million dollars a shot.

The utility and effectiveness of the B-2 in terms of range, payload, limiting collateral damage, cost of operations and survival of our military men and women are clear and understandable. It is exactly the right military capability needed to fight the next war. So why the reluctance to build that force?

Sticker shock. At over a half a billion dollars each, the B-2 seems unaffordable. But the fact is, the B-2 is actually a bargain. For one thing, the very expensive research and development costs to develop such a superior weapon have already been paid. Even more important, the B-2 does more than any other combat system. Compare it with a half dozen F-117s—the superstars of Desert Storm—which cost about as much as one B-2. But, with the B-2 you get eight times the payload and five times the range. And the B-2 requires much less expensive support to safely perform its mission. Consider that each time we send out a B-52 force with the expensive standoff munitions required to survive, we could send a comparable force of 15 B-2s—the resulting savings would pay for a brand new B-2.

The bottom line is that the price tag of military capabilities have gone up, and we had better spend our money wisely or we will pay for our mistakes. And we will pay in a currency far more precious than mere dollars—the lives of our military men and women.

How many B-2s do we need? No one knows for sure, but we are certain that the currently contracted force, which will yield slightly over a dozen operational aircraft, is too few. By any measure 20 B-2s are not enough. Unless we expand that plan, we will not achieve the potential of these revolutionary new capabilities—stealth, precision munitions and information technologies. We will not be able to achieve increased military capabilities with greater efficiency, less cost and reduced danger to U.S. forces. The current plan is simply too few.

As we develop clarity in our new national defense policies and strategies, we can more accurately define the exact numbers of modern systems required. That is precisely why we need to keep our options open now. A force of 40 or more B-2s is a reasonable estimate. It is obvious we will need to replace our aged fleet of B-52s as they become more and more costly to maintain and less survivable over the modern battlefield. To ignore the B-2 today, and end up building a new bomber after we find ourselves in the same position as when the Korean war started, will cost added tens of billions and take tens of years. Even if we have the money, we surely won't have the time.

We can debate whether or not we need our military forces in this post cold war world. To me a more reasonable discussion would be how the Washington Redskins are going to win next year's super bowl. But if we decide we will need military forces, and if we study recent history, we must conclude the B-2 will be a vital element of that force. When we look at all the factors—cost of targets destroyed, adaptability to the new way wars will be fought by the United States, and our desire to limit the suffering of non-belligerents and our own casualties—then the B-2 is the answer and a bargain to boot. We must keep the B-2 line open at a minimum rate as we define our security policies for the future and build the military forces required.

And we must seize the opportunity brought to us by America's technological genius. We can have a stronger, smaller and more efficient means to winning the next inevitable conflict—no matter when, where or how quickly it arises. That is exactly what the B-2 can do for us.

The B-2 presents us with an opportunity to ensure that future conflicts look like Desert Storm rather than the Korean War. Can we—in good conscience—do otherwise?

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. HORNER,  
*General, USAF (Ret.).*

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. It is rather rare that I come to speak on any issue from this well, but listening to this debate, Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit idly by and allow us one more time to start to plan something and tear it down in order to start again. We cannot sacrifice the defense of our Nation. We simply must do things in a way that they must be done in this day.

Back when Desert Storm came about, 1,200 planes were sent. If we had the B-2, we could have only sent 32. We would have saved lives. This investment saves dollars because it is the most cost-effective measure of defending our shores the way we have the military organized this day.

The other thing, we cannot continue to ask companies to organize to produce and then change and tear down that capability.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dellums-Kasich amendment and in support of the B-2.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], a long time member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and a person who is ex-

tremely knowledgeable about this particular program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich amendment and in support of the funding for further production of the B-2 bomber included in H.R. 2126.

I recognize that this is not an easy issue for many members, particularly for those of us who opposed the severe reductions in domestic spending included in previous appropriations bills.

I would be less than candid if I said that I was comfortable with the status of our national priorities as represented in House spending bills.

However, we cannot afford to be caught up in a zero-sum budget game that pits our national security needs against our domestic needs.

Let's be clear: If we cut the funding contained in this bill for the B-2, that money will not go to educate our children, or to train our unemployed. Cutting funds for the B-2 will not translate into increased spending for other important programs.

What it may do is unnecessarily harm the Nation's military preparedness; further erode the economies of areas already suffering from defense downsizing; and undermine potential technological advancements possible with a strong Stealth industrial base.

If we have learned anything in the short period which we refer to as "post cold war," it is that there is little we do know about the military contingencies we may face in the future.

We have essentially traded in an ERA where we knew who the enemy was and what the Nation's military might be called on to do, for an era of increasing complexity and changing dynamics.

Opponents and supporters of the B-2 will continue to argue about swing strategies, fighting two simultaneous conflicts at once, and the value of long range bombers over precision guided munitions. But as we debate these issues our ability to continue production of a technologically advanced bomber grinds to a halt.

Should we take a chance and lose the capability to quickly respond to unforeseen challenges?

We know that in the B-2 we have a bomber with: Revolutionary stealth technology; precision weapons capability; long range; large payload; and a bomber that is the only weapons system available to respond anywhere from the United States on the first day of conflict.

We also know that the bomber's industrial base—the only heavy bomber production line still active—is rapidly facing a final shutdown.

And we know that by 2010, any surviving B-52's will be 50 years old and probably retired, and that the B-1B will be 23 years old.

The B-2 is not cheap. But the costs of being unprepared in an increasingly dangerous world pale in comparison. In the midst of so much uncertainty in

the world, can we really afford to close the B-2 industrial base in the hope that we may not need it later? I think not.

For those of us representing regions whose economies have been driven by the defense and aerospace industry, there are certainly other factors motivating our support for the B-2.

Thirty years ago, the State of California was the cradle of the aerospace industry.

Southern California has provided the core of this technological effort with a skilled and motivated work force of highly dedicated men and women.

In a very short time, we have seen a major erosion of this industrial base, as California's aerospace industry has suffered a major decline: 133,000 direct aerospace jobs lost between 1988-93; 37,000 more will be gone by 1996; and 200,000 additional indirect jobs lost in the service industries supporting the aerospace work force.

Today, the only remaining combat aircraft in production in the region is the B-2 Stealth bomber.

The B-2 program has been essential to California's high technology aerospace industry. Thousands of subcontractors have been involved in development of this technology.

The B-2 industrial base in California and throughout the nation needs to be sustained. Not only for the sake of continued production of the bomber, but also for potential advances in technology that only a strong industrial base—and the men and women it employs—can support.

If we take together what we don't know about the future military threats the Nation may face, and what we do know about the vast capabilities of the B-2, it seems to me that we cannot afford to take a chance on the erosion of our bomber industrial base. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. OBEY Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saluting the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who I have worked with a number of times in support of deficit-reduction measures in a bipartisan way. And though I oppose the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], I do not think there is a Member of Congress who knows more about the technology and the minutia involved than the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, with that in mind, we are saying as 535 Members of Congress today, since the Senate did not put this in their bill, we have the opportunity to save the taxpayers one-half billion dollars, and \$20 billion over the course of the next 10 years, by voting for the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

We are also saying that we are going to look at every corner of deficit reduction in Federal spending, but not in defense and not on the B-2 bomber. That is exempt. We are saying to the Secretary of Defense, we know more than

you do about the B-2 bomber. You do not want it, Mr. Secretary, but we are going to make you buy 20 more.

Please vote for the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues are concerned, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], that this gentleman is maintaining 10 minutes. I am going to take the 10 minutes, because to tell the truth at any given time, it is still the truth.

Mr. Chairman, let us start off remembering where we ended in August. We ended in August talking about balancing the budget and we cut programs and wreaked havoc and extended pain to millions of American people in this country.

We cut programs for the children in this country; our future. We cut programs that affected the farmers; the people who feed us in this country. We cut programs for the veterans, for the senior citizens, for urban, rural, and suburban America.

So, we come back from the August break; now we are on the defense appropriations bill. The first amendment, B-2. And, suddenly, all these people who were willing to inflict pain on the American people cannot inflict pain upon the Pentagon. I hear the sizzle of pork and I will talk about it, but I will also talk about the substance, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

One of my colleagues said we should be talking about what is essential and I will argue that the B-2 is not essential, it is not needed, it is not affordable, and there are alternatives.

Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues from California said, Well, the rationale for buying 20 more B-2's is the money will not go for domestic programs. Hogwash. This program will cost us minimally \$31.5 billion, not million. \$31.5 billion. We are only going to appropriate a measly \$500 million this year, but that is the camel's nose under the tent. So, we will not be able to argue next year, the year after that, the year after that, and the year after that, Mr. Chairman, for priorities that speak to the highest and the best of our people in this country who are suffering.

B-2 bomber. Mr. Chairman, we already spent \$44 billion for the first 20. It will cost us \$19.7 billion in production. Add that together and that is in excess of \$63 billion. Operation and maintenance is \$11.7 billion for the next 20. Multiply that twice for the first 20 and the second 20 and we are up to 80-some billion to maintain 40 aircraft.

It will cost \$65 billion for 40. That is not a billion-dollar plane. That is a 1.5-billion Batmobile we do not need.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, these costs are conservative. I have been here nearly 25 years and not one program has ever gone as the con-

tractor said it would go. Mr. Chairman, \$31.5 will be cheap for the next 20.

Second, they say seven Secretaries have indicated their support for the B-2. The important point is the present Secretary charged with the significant national defense concerns of this Nation says we do not need it. And, incidentally, he was the father of B-2.

Secretary Cheney sends a letter out to the majority leader in this Congress and said, I had to acquiesce to 20 B-2's because the Congress said do it. That is fallacious and I can document it, Mr. Chairman.

From Department of Defense Press Release numbered 29-92 in January 29, 1992, so check it out, it is objective, here is what Secretary Cheney said:

We can now afford to be more deliberate in the pace at which we modernize our armed forces. And the emergence of democratically inspired reformers in the republics of the former Soviet Union presents an historic opportunity to make further reductions in the world's strategic arsenal, as the President proposed last night in his State of the Union address.

Secretary Cheney said he will therefore stop the Air Force's B-2 stealth bomber program after the 20th aircraft is produced.

January 1992, before the Congress of the United States even got the budget. That is the facts.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] argues that if we had had B-2, the gentleman would not have been shot down in the F-16, or he spoke to the Mirage. Mr. Chairman, let us talk about facts. The F-16 and the Mirage are fighter aircraft. Do my colleagues know what the response to the F-16 and the Mirage on a stealthy basis is? It is the F-22, not the B-2. Does my colleague think somebody is going to fly this big B-2 around?

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, the B-2 bomber at this point cannot even tell if it is flying in the rain or flying in the mountain range. It cannot be flown in the daytime. It can be seen. Stealth does not mean invisible. There are several ways to detect a plane. One of them is infrared, the other is optical. You can see it. You can detect it with infrared. That is real, Mr. Chairman.

Next point: Where on this Earth do we need to fly more than 20 B-2 bombers? Against a Third World country? We talk about integrated air defenses. Mr. Chairman, there is not one nation in the world at this point with an integrated air defense. Not one. No one tells you that.

The closest that the world ever came to that was the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. Integrated air defense means comprehensive, interrelated, and synergistic. If my colleagues do not understand those words, look them up in a dictionary and find out.

A B-1 bomber can fly against any air defense that exists in the world today. There are no crackpots on this earth, there is no Third World country on this Earth, neither can the Soviet Union or the United States at this moment, given the incredible financial problems

that plague this Nation and plague this world, that have the capacity to develop an integrated air defense.

Next point: One B-2 bomber is equivalent to 75 tactical aircraft. Mr. Chairman, those 75 aircraft already exist in the inventory. We paid for them. None of these 20 B-2 bombers are programmed in next year's budget, or the year after that, or the year after that. So that whole chart business is phony and was supplied by the contractor anyway and ought to be dismissed for self-interest.

Let us talk about the jobs. Mr. Chairman, Members of the committee, we already lost 20-some-thousand in the B-2, and there are 8,000 people working. They have not built all but 20 yet. There are 7 more to deliver, so people have got to work on it. Because not one B-2 looks like the next B-2, because they keep changing it each time, 18 of the 20 will have to be retrofit and standardized. Somebody has got to do the work.

Finally, in the contract, the contractor must maintain depot maintenance into the year 2005. Somebody's got to do the work.

Mr. Chairman, I understand jobs, but to the tune of \$31.5 billion to build a plane that the Pentagon says they do not want, they do not need, and there are alternatives, is a sham. It is a shame. You give me \$31.5 billion; I will put a hell of a lot more than 8,000 people to work; \$31.5 billion is an incredible amount of money.

Mr. Chairman, the people that are charged with the responsibility of fighting the war, this is not talking about them. Charged with putting their lives on the line, and not speaking "Will the gentleman yield about it," they do not want this plane.

Mr. Chairman, for those budget people who argue, well, this will not go to the deficit, the only way that can be true is you have got to have a trade-off. If the people who are the proponents of B-2 and are also budget cutters, because they go home and tell their community that, why do they not tell them they are prepared to cut all of these other programs? Cut the F-22, cut all the C-17's and what have you. But look at their voting record. They are going to back up to the voting record and they are going to vote for all those programs as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this turkey. It is not needed.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, we have kept our promises to the American people. We have made the hard cuts in spending, while we are maintaining a strong defense for our Nation. Keeping our Nation strong means having a vision into the future defense of this country and having the ability and the technology to carry out our Nation's objectives.

We have heard many arguments for and against the B-2. We have heard

about the cost benefits and the strategic benefits. We have heard about capabilities, performance, and jobs. But the B-2 is about people. It is about our men and women who serve this country in uniform. It is about giving them the equipment and technology to defend and protect our Nation and its principles in time of conflict.

We have that technology today. Here it is. Technology that allows our Department of Defense to risk the fewest American lives in time of conflict. The B-2 stands ready as a system designed to protect this Nation from threat of war and minimize the loss of life. Let us face it, that is what we are really talking about here is lives.

Is it a difficult choice? Of course, it is. Most likely, one of the most difficult votes a Member will have to cast this year. But this is a vote which carries with it a vision for the future; the future of this Nation's defense posture and the task of keeping America strong.

Someone once said: A task without a vision is drudgery. A vision without a task is a dream. A task with a vision is victory.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues today that the B-2 is that vision, the keystone in keeping our Nation's defense strong. The American people sent us here to make changes. Those who believe in the status quo never thought we could make serious cuts while keeping our military strong. Let us send a message back to the American people. Vote against this cutting amendment.

□ 1215

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from southern California [Ms. HARMAN], a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am often a supporter of the initiatives offered by the sponsors of this amendment—and always an admirer—but on this issue of striking the B-2 funding, I rise in strong opposition.

In my view, the B-2 saves lives, saves money, and saves a critical asset—our bomber industrial base.

As a mother of two draft-age children, my first question about any defense acquisition program is, "Will it save lives?" The answer is a resounding yes.

Many arguments have been made in favor of this incredible aircraft, but I want to emphasize one:

We can afford to buy more B-2's and we should. Within the budget resolution profile, money is available as we: First, retire the expensive, aging B-52 fleet, second, buy the cheaper munitions the B-2 uses, and, third, reap savings from acquisition reform.

Much of the argument against more B-2's assumes the B-52 will remain combat capable through the year 2030. The last B-52H was produced in the

early 1960's, so the aircraft will be almost 70 years old in 2030.

If the B-52 were a person at that time, it would be collecting Social Security. Do we want to send our sons and daughters to war in a 70-year-old bomber? I don't think so. I think we want to use the most survivable aircraft possible, an aircraft we have in production right now—the B-2.

The cost of the aircraft is a concern to us all. But it is half the cost its opponents estimate.

The B-2 saves us money by using cheaper weapons. The old B-52 and the B-1 use expensive guided missiles and bombs to fly in from standoff orbits. Since the B-2 can go right to even the most heavily defended target, it can use cheaper laser and gravity bombs, which cost about one one-hundredth the cost of the B-52's weapons.

The new Deputy Defense Secretary testified this May 18 before the Senate Armed Services Committee that:

If I do not have any carriers available for 15 days and I do not have any tactical aircraft in theater and I do not have any means to get tactical aircraft in theater and we have to continue with this MRC scenario, then I am going to need a lot more bombers than I have in the current force.

That means B-2's.

We can find further savings in acquisition reform. Last year, Secretary Perry testified that as much as \$30 billion could be saved by downsizing and procurement reform over 5 years. Those savings would kick in just when they are needed most. They would provide more than enough funds for the B-2 within the budget resolution profile.

As the mother of the lockbox, no Member is more committed to deficit reduction than I am. But this is not the way to get smart, prudent deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, as a parent, I am convinced that we must field and fully fund the most effective and survivable weapons systems. The most precious resource this country has is our children. Today, in this House, let us choose the best defense for our children and the men and women who will defend them. Vote against the Kasich-Dellums amendment. We need the B-2.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, as a co-sponsor I rise in support of the Dellums-Kasich amendment. There are only three problems with the B-2 bomber. First, it does not work. It cannot tell the difference between a rain cloud and a mountain. Second, it costs a fortune, \$2.2 billion per airplane. Third, we do not need it. What we have been told by the Pentagon, the people who beg us for military expenditures, is do not put any more money into this airplane, we do not need it, and yet today we find that the wind beneath the wings of the B-2 bomber is not national security, it is the clout of defense contractors which stand to bank billions of dollars if Congress will approve this unnecessary boondoggle.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when this Congress is cutting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and health care, it is unconscionable that we would spend up to \$30 billion for an airplane that does not work, that costs \$2.2 billion a copy, and one that military experts tell us is totally unnecessary.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking Democrat member of the Subcommittee on National Security, and our former longtime chairman.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the practical aspects of the B-2 bomber.

One of the things that we try to make decisions on is which weapon system will be the most important to the national security depending on the threat to the Nation. The most effective weapon system we can buy is the one that deters war, that is never used in a war, and I think the B-2, with the amount of money we have available to us, it is certainly not the time to stop it. For instance, if we had less money, it would be a tougher decision, but, with the amount of money that the Committee on the Budget allocated to the defense subcommittee, it certainly would be a mistake for us to cut out the B-2 at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, what I recommend to the Members, and I have been involved in the B-2 for years; as a matter of fact, I was willing to jump over the B-1 and go with the B-2 because of the technology, because of the ability of the B-2 to penetrate defense systems: Now, even though we do not have the threat now, what we want is an airplane that will deter an enemy from attacking us, and I think the B-2 is that airplane.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members of Congress to allow us to go forward, to go to conference. Hopefully we will have a good allocation in conference and we will be able to continue the B-2. The big expense for the B-2 comes next year. But I am confident that, as the threat continues, as the threat changes, this Subcommittee on Defense will make the appropriate decision on the B-2, and I think at this point the Members should feel confident to vote for this with the amount of money available.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to strongly support the B-2 as we move forward to conference.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, the debate is about the future.

Do my colleagues know what this is? Tomahawk missile. I say to my colleagues, "If you launch this either from a ship or from the B-52, which the generals and the Pentagon want to maintain along with 95 B-1's and 20 B-2's, you know what? Your pilot is not in danger." See, it is about the future.

The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has a big platform outside of this office. That platform can be used to replace the aircraft carrier. We can land C-17's on this platform. See, it is about the future.

The B-2; that is a 1970's-1980's plane. F-22? Uses elements of stealth, but also uses maneuverability and speed. See, it is about the future, it is about effectiveness.

And who can we go to learn about effectiveness? Do my colleagues know who we go to if we do not want to trust the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs that does not want the plane, or the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs? Do my colleagues know who we go to? The commanders in the field who have to carry out the mission. Not one single ground commander, not one single CINC, the commanders in charge of our troops in the field, not one of them want to buy B-2 bombers, not one of them.

Do my colleagues know why? Because they are looking for an effective and efficient defense to protect our soldiers in the future, and, as the general in charge of acquisition in the Air Force said, "If you buy the B-2, you prevent us from being able to buy the things that we really need to secure the defense of this Nation."

See, this debate really is about the future. It really is about what is the most effective way to meet the threat in this world, and, when we got the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, who has taken the navy on himself, arguing about more effective and efficient ways to project power, who has written letter after letter and made speech after speech saying, "End this system at 20," my colleagues coming to the House floor, we have got to vote for the most efficient, effective defense.

Vote for the Kasich-Dellums amendment. Make the commonsense choice.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] in support of the B-2, a senior member of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the current events in the world are absolute proof to us that we must always maintain the very highest degree of technology and the very most effective forces for our armed services. Now is not the time to take a step back. Now is the time to take a step forward. The B-2 is in my opinion absolutely essential and in many ways enhances the fighting capability of our forces.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining minute and a half.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] just stepped on a landmine. What he forgot to tell us with the standoff cruise missile is that it costs \$1.2 million a copy. That is a lot of money compared to \$20,000 for the JDAMS.

Second, a standoff cruise missile has no capability against mobile targets.

Rand did a study. Three B-2s interdicting Saddam's division moving into Kuwait with the sensor-fused weapon, a smart submunition, knocked out 46 percent of the mechanized vehicles in that division. The B-2 also, with the block 30 upgrade, will have an ability to go after the launchers for the Scud missiles. We might have been able to prevent the war, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] said.

Conventional deterrence is in our grasp if we have an adequate number of B-2's. Every expert, Rand, Colin Powell, Jasper Welch, say the right number is somewhere between 40 and 60. Let us not end this program now. The line is open. We should buy these bombers. We can get 20 additional B-2's for \$15.3 billion. We can retire other planes in order to make room for life-cycle costs.

The B-2 is the right weapons system for the future. It will have American lives. Our kids will not get shot down like Captain O'Grady got shot down, and this is the most important issue. To kill this program I think would be a tragedy for the American people and a tragedy for our future military capability. If we have to come back, we are going to have to spend \$10 billion just to reopen the production line.

We must keep the B-2 line open. The weapons for the B-2 are very cheap. This is a revolutionary conventional capability.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

We should not spend money we don't have on planes we do not need. Twenty more B-2 bombers will not help our children, our sick, our elderly, or national security. Buying more will not make our world a safer place.

President Eisenhower warned us of this day. He said: "every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."

This is the choice we make today. The time must come for a great nation to have the courage, the raw courage, not to spend millions and billions of dollars on weapons of mass destruction.

The time has come. Look in our hearts. Gather the courage to do what is right. Say "no" to more B-2's. Say "yes" to our children, our people, our future.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a distinguished member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for yielding me this time. My colleagues, we are close to this vote, and what we are doing today is going down the path that we commenced after Vietnam because during Vietnam we lost 2,200 aircraft, mostly to SAM missiles. We lost aircraft that had pilots from every congressional district in this Nation.

The smartest people in this country got together at our request, Congress and the President, and we asked, "Is there any way to avoid radar so we can protect our pilots?" Then, lo and behold, the great American technological base came up with stealth, with the ability to avoid radar.

Now probably radar, the invention of radar, was the greatest military invention of this century. I would say the ability to avoid radar is probably the second greatest invention of this century.

If we do not go with the B-2 bomber, we are going to see pilots go down just like Mr. O'Grady went down. Do not reject this technology. Protect our pilots.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 minute, 20 seconds exactly.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] says that the studies show that we need to have 40 B-2 bombers rather than 20. That is not true. The major study done, the Kaminski study which reviewed 17 other studies, indicated that the best buy for the United States was not 40 B-2's, but 20. Everybody knows it.

Second, if we are talking about tradeoffs, just from the cost of the additional two B-2 bombers he wants to buy this year we could help 1,100,000 more kids under chapter 1, we could help 600,000 or 6 million families to receive low-income heating assistance, which we just cut out of the budget. We would still have enough left to provide summer youth jobs for 300,000 kids.

□ 1230

You talk about comparative defense expenditures. The red lines on this chart indicate the Soviet Union has reduced its budget by 70 percent, its military budget. Our budget has hardly moved in comparison to that. There is no question of where the major threats come from.

Mr. Chairman, if you take a look at how our budget compares to potential enemies, we are spending militarily about 2.5 times as much as all of them combined, including all of the rogue states that are talked about. This is a flying turkey. It will primarily benefit defense contractors, not the defense posture of the United States. We ought to pass this amendment and save the money.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of every young man and woman, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, all of us hope and pray that in the future that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] referred to, Americans never have to go to war again, whether on the ground or in the air or under the sea or on the sea. But the way the world looks, it does not look like that is going to be a real choice.

Mr. Chairman, while we were on recess, there were major bombing campaigns taking place in which the United States is by far the major player in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We do not know when or where we may be called upon to deploy military forces. If and when we do, I believe this Congress under our constitutional mandate has the responsibility to provide those people that we send to war the best training possible and the best equipment possible and the best technology possible to let them accomplish their mission, do their job, and give themselves a little protection while they are doing it.

This type of stealthy technology may not be ready to fly today. It is in a development process still, as every other airplane program has been and every future airplane program will be. But when this airplane flies, it will give our troops protection from the air that they would love to have. If you do not believe it, check with anybody who served in Desert Shield-Desert Storm when the F-117 stealthy airplane flew into Baghdad and disrupted Saddam's ability to conduct the war, and they did so without any casualty, without any loss of aircraft, because of the technology that we had invested in.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of the F-117 and the technology, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] wants me to remind everyone about the former Secretaries of Defense who supported the B-2. They also supported the F-117, except to a point about 10 years ago when the Department of Defense decided they did not need any more F-117's, and in fact they suggested we cancel the program. It was our subcommittee and this Congress who decided that, regardless of their objection, we would not terminate the F-117 program. Where is there a better success story today?

The Congress was right. We filled out the squadrons of the F-117's. We gave the pilots who flew those airplanes the technology to do an effective job against Saddam Hussein and to protect their lives while they were doing it.

So again, join me; hope and pray that we never have to send an American into combat again. But today, Americans are flying combat missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, so we cannot guarantee that they never have to go again. But if they do, let us have our conscience clear, that we did the best job that we could to make sure they had the technology necessary, the

training, and the ability to do their job as they protect their lives.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, while I respectfully understand the concerns of my colleague and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I am pleased that the committee has appropriated research and development funds in fiscal year 1996 for the F-22 advanced tactical fighter. In fact, the committee reports that additional funding will enable the Air Force to maintain original production and capability schedules—resulting in an overall savings of \$350-400 million over the life of this program.

The F-22 will serve as our Nation's next generation premier fighter replacing the successful F-16. It will be designed to have both air-to-air and air-to-ground fighter capabilities and operate at supersonic, super-cruise conditions for significant periods of time. The F-22 advanced tactical fighter will be more survivable and stealthier than any fighter jet currently before us.

Earlier this year, this aircraft successfully passed its preliminary design review, which, as many of you know, signals the near completion of its design. With the growth of advanced surface-to-air and air-to-air missiles, with the increase in technological development in military forces around the world, the need for the F-22 becomes clearer each day. Furthermore, as we continue to reduce our military forces and shift defense dollars, the need for a fighter that requires less maintenance, less support, and less manpower grows stronger.

The F-22 represents only 3 percent of the Pentagon's research, development, and procurement accounts. This is a very small investment that will provide dominance in the skies. Reliance on air superiority has taken us through several conflicts in recent years and it is improbable that we could ever win a war without it. Our decision today has that kind of potential impact. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Obey amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I am outraged at the way defense contractors make public policy around here. I thought we Members of Congress were sent here to think for ourselves but, unfortunately, I have learned otherwise.

The July 31 issue of Defense Week details contributions by Northrup Grumman's political action committee and the June vote for more B-2's. Northrup donated \$167,850 to House Members between January and June 30 and 96 percent of the money went to Members who voted for the extra B-2's.

In June alone, Northrup donated \$75,200 to House Members. Of that \$75,200, 97 percent went to 47 Members who voted for more B-2's.

Is the B-2 being promoted because it is an absolute necessity for our Nation's defense—or could it be because a contractor has deep pockets?

I want to quote DOD Deputy Secretary White who told us last month, "The Department cannot support procurement of additional B-2's," and "The Department loses approximately \$3 billion per year in purchasing power for higher priority programs."

The Department of Defense doesn't want more B-2's, the B-2 has difficulty distinguishing between a raincloud and a mountain, and we cannot afford to spend \$31 billion on 20 more of them.

It only makes people more cynical about Washington to see money talk and carry out the contractors' wishes. I hope my colleagues won't vote to throw \$31 billion at a plane we don't need.

[From Defense Week, July 31, 1995]

NORTHROP GRUMMAN'S '95 CONTRIBUTIONS  
SEEM TIMED FOR B-2 ACTION

(By Tony Capaccio)

Illustrating the synergy between legislation and campaign contributions, of \$167,850 the Northrop Grumman Corp. political action committee (PAC) donated to House lawmakers between January and June 30, all but \$7,400 went to members voting last month to provide additional B-2 funding.

In June alone, the corporate PAC donated \$75,200 to House lawmakers, of which \$73,200 went to 47 members who voted June 13 to defeat an amendment stripping \$553 million in added B-2 money.

It was added to the fiscal 1996 defense authorization.

Another vote to cut the funding is scheduled for later this week as the House debates the fiscal 1996 \$244.1 billion appropriations bill.

The dollars and cents aspect is just one—and totally legal—facet of the aggressive Northrop Grumman Corp. campaign to keep open its B-2 production line. Spokesman Tony Cantalio declined to discuss any aspect of Northrop's contributions policy after Defense Week posed written questions.

Detailing which B-2 supporters received Northrop Grumman contributions this year in no way is meant to imply that their votes were "bought," only that the corporation is not bashful about assisting members who acknowledge and agree with its point of view.

In fact, a handful of members who received contributions voted against added funding. They include: Reps. Paul McHale (D-Pa.) \$1,000; Patrick Flanagan (D-Ill.), \$500; Rick Lazio (R-N.Y.) \$850; and Reps. Frank Pallone (D-N.J.), Jack Quinn (R-N.Y.) and Frank Riggs (R-Calif.), who received \$500 each this year.

But coming as they have in the course of the B-2 debate, the donations no doubt assure access and give Northrop Grumman officials an advantage in getting their story heard. Where once 40,000 workers nationwide assembled B-2 parts and aircraft at the height of production in 1992, according to spokesman Ed Smith, now 16,500 workers are directly employed as the last four of 20 bombers on order are in final assembly.

Aspects of the Northrop Grumman B-2 campaign and political contributions were detailed in a report released last month by the Center for Responsive Politics, a liberal, Washington, D.C.-based public interest group.

The group's campaign figures went to April 30. Defense Week reviewed donations made in May and June. The June donations were made primarily in three clusters, on June 2, June 26 and June 29. The House vote was June 13.

The Northrop Grumman donations consist mainly of \$500 amounts. The largest figures have gone to members of the congressional B-2 "core" support group: Reps. Ike Skelton (D-Mo.), Norman Dicks (D-Wash.), Duncan Hunter (R-Calif.), Jane Harman (D-Calif.), Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.), Buck McKeon (R-Calif.) and House Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-Texas).

The maximum PAC donation each could receive under campaign spending laws is \$5,000 per election and primary.

Armey, for example, received the maximum donation on March 9. During the June debate he praised the bomber—still only 50 percent through its testing—as a "flying

miracle." House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) did not vote last month but will likely support the bomber when the debate begins this week. Northrop Grumman on June 26 donated \$1,000 for his 1996 primary, adding to a \$2,000 St. Patrick's Day contribution.

Since its merger with Grumman, Northrop has more clout with the New York delegation and has adjusted its contribution patterns accordingly.

New York Reps. Gary Ackerman (D), Ben Gilman (R), Gerry Solomon (R) and Maurice Hinchey (D) co-authored a June 7 "Dear Colleague" soliciting B-2 support. They wrote that New York, "with over 225 of its companies having supported B-2 production at various times since 1987, will lose significant economic activity" if production ends.

Ackerman had received a \$500 contribution in March. Solomon and Hinchey received \$1,000 and \$500 donations respectively on May 16. Gilman received a \$750 contribution June 2.

B-2 supporters who received the largest Northrop Grumman donations in June either before or after the vote were:

McKeon, who received \$500 on June 2 and \$4,000 June 26. He told Defense Week earlier this year that one of his primary reasons for seeking a seat on the House National Security Committee was to fight for retention of the B-2 production line.

Harman, a debate floor manager, who received \$5,000 June 28.

Vic Fazio (D-Calif.), who made a floor speech defending additional funding, received \$500 on June 2 and \$4,500 June 26.

Rep. Jerry Lewis (R-Calif.), a key B-2 supporter organizing this week's floor debate and who issued a stinging rebuttal to the recent critical General Accounting Office draft report, received \$4,500 on June 26.

Rep. Randy Cunningham (R-Calif.) had received \$3,500 between January and May from Northrop Grumman, took in another \$500 on June 2 and \$1,500 June 26.

Members who voted to retain added B-2 funding and received their first Northrop Grumman contributions after the vote included: Joe McDade (R-Pa.), \$2,000 on June 14; Robert Walker (R-Pa.), \$1,000; Reps. Henry Bonilla (D-Texas), \$1,000; Wayne Alford (R-Col.), \$1,000; Bob Matsui (D-Calif.), \$500; Michael Forbes (R-N.Y.), \$500; John Doolittle (R-Calif.), \$500; Helen Chenoweth (R-Idaho), \$500; Gary Franks (R-Ct.), \$500, and Alan Mollohan (D-W.V.), \$500.

Charles Wilson (D-Texas), who did not vote on June 13, received a \$5,000 contribution 11 days earlier.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment to cut \$493 million from advanced Air Force procurement for additional B-2 bomber funding.

My opposition to additional B-2 funding is based largely on the great fiscal constraints facing our Nation and the reality that these budget limits may eventually require that we revise our adherence to the current two-war strategy. The most pressing problem facing the Federal Government is the \$5 trillion national debt and the need to balance the budget. Given the pressing need to reduce the deficit, it will be very hard to maintain current defense spending, much less increase it significantly. Therefore, I believe it will be very difficult to properly fund our current strategy to fight two major wars simultaneously. I agree we would need closer to 30-40 B-2's for this strategy, but given a lack of an imminent global challenge from a competing superpower, let alone a likely scenario under which we would have to fight two major concurrent wars, I cannot at this time support additional funding.

I am also swayed by two 1995 studies commissioned by the Department of Defense at

the direction of Congress, which found that there are other, more cost-effective options for improving U.S. military capabilities than buying additional B-2's at this time. According to these credible reports, the currently planned bomber force can meet military requirements for fighting two major regional conflicts through a mix of B-52's, B-1's, and B-2's. It would be more cost effective to buy additional precision-guided munitions for the bomber force and to upgrade B-1's than to build more than 20 B-2's.

Lastly, my opposition to additional B-2 funding is not based on the supposition that we may never need to use them. Indeed, we might. It rests more in part on the notion that we need a better understanding of the military capabilities of the different blocks, or types, of B-2's. The recent General Accounting Office report on the B-2 claiming unsolved technical shortcomings concerns me greatly. And while Pentagon Acquisition Chief Paul Kaminski rebutted the report, he did not advocate the purchase of more B-2's.

While we might be able to afford the additional funds the Appropriations Committee has proposed this year, as we move down the road to the year 2002, and toward a balanced budget, agreeing to further funds to procure twenty more B-2's—at a potential total cost of close to \$40 billion—will most certainly be a budget buster. Funding more B-2's this year could lead us unwillingly toward procurement of further B-2's in future defense budgets that cannot support them without cuts in funding for the operation and maintenance of our troops and other weapons systems. Funding more B-2's while we are trying to balance the budget could also result in unfair cuts in other areas of the budget as well.

Although I am a strong support supporter of a robust and fully well-rounded defense posture, at this time of fiscal restraint, I find it hard to justify such an expenditure. The billions of dollars required to sustain such an effort is not a necessity and is not affordable.

I have great respect for those who support the B-2. To be sure, it is an awesome aircraft that I am sure will contribute greatly to our defense needs. But given the aforementioned factors that are weighing on me, at this time I cannot support additional funding.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment being offered by my distinguished colleagues Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. KASICH. My comments today are straightforward: The B-2 is no longer needed, it does not work properly, and the scarce American dollars that fund it should be better spent.

The B-2 bomber belongs in a museum. It was designed as a long-range bomber to attack the Soviet Union after a nuclear war. It is nothing short of a travesty that the threat to our wallets has not subsided along with the demise of our cold war adversary. The proposed 20 additional B-2's will cost an astounding \$31 billion according to the Air Force. The 20 planes already being built are expected to cost \$44 billion, but this years Defense authorization bill lifted the cap in the expectation they will cost even more. This all for a plane that the Air Force now says it does not even want.

I rise to tell you the taxpayers of Detroit do not want this plane either. They want their star schools funding back because they would rather put computers in a classroom than in a

flying turkey. The taxpayers also want their low-income home energy assistance back. And most of all, they want their jobs back but they will not even get that because the cuts in job training made last month will keep the 14,000 eligible Michigan job-seekers from receiving training.

According to the General Accounting Office, the B-2 has failed many of its basic tests and although I know we are talking about a bomber and not a weather plane, it is important to mention that it cannot tell the difference between a raincloud and a mountain. That does not sound like a plane that costs \$2.2 billion apiece.

Many people think that every weapon is worth voting for just because it will create jobs. But a Congressional Research Service study I commissioned a few years ago found that money spent in education, transportation, or construction would create far more job than money spent on defense. The jobs argument makes even less sense for the B-2 because out of the jobs cut in aircraft manufacturing since 1989, 90 percent of them are not needed to build the additional bombers and therefore will not come back. Moreover, the recent heavy bomber industrial capabilities study done for the Pentagon noted that the bomber industry is not a unique industrial base that we need to keep warm in the remote event we ever needed to build bombers in the future.

I urge you to support this crucial amendment in the name of economic security, political responsibility, and just plain reality.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my support for the Kasich-Dellums amendment to remove \$493 million for advanced procurement for additional B-2 bombers from the national security appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. I feel this amendment represents a sound policy, in terms of both national security and fiscal responsibility.

I recognize that real threats to the national security of the United States exist in the post-cold-war world, and I believe we must provide the armed services with the resources they need to protect American citizens and the U.S. role in world affairs. Today, however, military challenges are very different than they were just a few years ago. We must tailor our military force to meet those challenges, and we must do so within very strict budget constraints.

An independent study recently determined, and the Air Force confirmed, that additional B-2 bombers are not wanted or needed in order to develop a force necessary to meet the challenges of today's world. The Air Force has higher priority programs that may be crowded out by the purchase of additional B-2's—programs such as improving the B-1 and purchasing more smart weapons that can perform many of the functions of the B-2 in a more cost-effective manner. And for instances where the B-2 is clearly the only suitable aircraft, we can rely on the 20 B-2's already purchased by the Air Force and currently under production.

It seems clear to me that the purchase of additional B-2's at this time is unwise policy. As we in Congress strive to change the face of Government spending practices and reduce the deficit, actual costs of this program must be scrutinized. It is true that the bill before us today includes just under \$500 million for additional B-2's. The total cost of these planes, however, could exceed \$20 billion. The de-

fense authorization bill that this body passed earlier this year removed the spending cap for additional B-2's—as well as for the 20 already purchased—leaving the final purchase price dangling high above us, at a level no one yet knows.

In light of the budget crisis facing this Nation, and in light of projected defense funding shortfalls in the tens of billions of dollars over the next several years, I urge my colleagues to prove to the American people that this Congress is serious about bringing Federal spending under control by supporting the Kasich-Dellums amendment.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the B-2 bomber truly is an extraordinary aircraft. After 14 years of flunking a whole series of Air Force performance tests, this year the B-2 has evaded detection by Republican budget-cutting radar, overcome Pentagon efforts to end further procurement, and out-maneuvered taxpayer groups working for a balanced budget.

This "Airborne Edsel," however, does seem to have difficulty handling more tangible obstacles like rainclouds and mountainsides. According to a report prepared by the General Accounting Office, the B-2's radar cannot distinguish rain from other obstacles and has fallen short of meeting some of its most important mission requirements. The GAO report indicates that software problems have delayed flight tests, changes in the plane's mission will further increase costs, and the contractor—after 9 years of production—is still delivering B-2's that don't meet Air Force mission requirements.

Originally designed to drop nuclear bombs on the Soviet Union, the B-2 is the plane that time forgot. The cold war's over, Chechnya—not world conquest—preoccupies Russian military thinkers, and the Air Force now places a higher priority on other weapons systems. Still, the call for more B-2's persists.

The Nation's top military officials oppose further procurement of B-2 bombers, including: The Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force Chief of Staff.

An Air Force budget paper makes it crystal clear: "Given the current threat, there is no military requirement for additional B-2's." Let's make the Stealth bomber truly invisible by eliminating funding for more bombers.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 213, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 639]

AYES—210

Abercrombie	Barton	Brown (OH)
Andrews	Bass	Brownback
Archer	Becerra	Bryant (TN)
Baldacci	Beilenson	Bunn
Ballenger	Bereuter	Burr
Barcia	Bilbray	Camp
Barrett (NE)	Blute	Cardin
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Castle

Chabot	Johnston	Peterson (MN)
Christensen	Kanjorski	Petri
Clay	Kaptur	Porter
Clayton	Kasich	Portman
Clement	Kleczka	Poshard
Coble	Kennedy (MA)	Pryce
Coburn	Kennedy (RI)	Quinn
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Radanovich
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Rahall
Condit	Kingston	Ramstad
Conyers	Kleczka	Rangel
Costello	Klink	Reed
Coyne	Klug	Regula
Creameans	Kolbe	Riggs
Danner	LaFalce	Rivers
Deal	Lantos	Roemer
DeFazio	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLauro	Latham	Roth
Dellums	LaTourette	Roukema
Deutsch	Lazio	Roybal-Allard
Dickey	Leach	Rush
Dingell	Levin	Sabo
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Doyle	Lincoln	Sanford
Duncan	Lipinski	Sawyer
Durbin	LoBiondo	Schroeder
Ehlers	Lofgren	Schumer
Engel	Lowey	Scott
Eshoo	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Evans	Markey	Serrano
Farr	Martini	Shadegg
Fattah	Mascara	Shays
Fields (LA)	McCarthy	Shuster
Flake	McDermott	Skaggs
Flanagan	McHale	Slaughter
Foglietta	McInnis	Smith (MI)
Foley	McNulty	Smith (WA)
Ford	Meehan	Stark
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Stenholm
Franks (NJ)	Mfume	Stockman
Furse	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Ganske	Miller (FL)	Studds
Gejdenson	Mineta	Stupak
Gekas	Minge	Tanner
Gibbons	Mink	Torkildsen
Goodlatte	Molinari	Towns
Goodling	Moran	Upton
Gordon	Myrick	Velazquez
Greenwood	Nadler	Vento
Gunderson	Neal	Wamp
Gutierrez	Ney	Watt (NC)
Gutknecht	Nussle	Waxman
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Weldon (PA)
Hamilton	Obey	White
Heineman	Olver	Williams
Hilliard	Orton	Wise
Hoekstra	Owens	Woolsey
Houghton	Pallone	Wyden
Hutchinson	Parker	Wynn
Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Yates
Jacobs	Payne (NJ)	Zeliff
Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Zimmer
	Pelosi	

NOES—213

Ackerman	Clinger	Fox
Army	Clyburn	Franks (CT)
Bachus	Coleman	Frelinghuysen
Baessler	Collins (GA)	Frisa
Baker (CA)	Combest	Frost
Baker (LA)	Cooley	Funderburk
Barr	Cramer	Gallegly
Bartlett	Crane	Gephardt
Bateman	Crapo	Geren
Bentsen	Cubin	Gilchrest
Berman	Cunningham	Gillmor
Bevill	Davis	Gilman
Bilirakis	de la Garza	Gingrich
Bliley	DeLay	Gonzalez
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Goss
Boehner	Dicks	Graham
Bonilla	Dixon	Green
Bono	Dooley	Hall (TX)
Borski	Doollittle	Hancock
Boucher	Dornan	Hansen
Brewster	Dreier	Harman
Browder	Dunn	Hastert
Brown (CA)	Edwards	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	Ehrlich	Hastings (WA)
Bryant (TX)	Emerson	Hayes
Bunning	English	Hayworth
Burton	Ensign	Hefley
Buyer	Everett	Hefner
Callahan	Ewing	Herger
Calvert	Fawell	Hilleary
Canady	Fazio	Hincheey
Chambliss	Fields (TX)	Hobson
Chapman	Filner	Hoke
Chenoweth	Forbes	Holden
Chrysler	Fowler	Horn

Hostettler	Mica	Souder
Hoyer	Mollohan	Spence
Hunter	Montgomery	Spratt
Hyde	Moorhead	Stearns
Inglis	Murtha	Stump
Istook	Myers	Talent
Jefferson	Nethercutt	Tate
Johnson (CT)	Neumann	Tauzin
Johnson, E.B.	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, Sam	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Jones	Oxley	Tejeda
Kelly	Packard	Thomas
Kim	Paxon	Thompson
King	Peterson (FL)	Thornberry
Knollenberg	Pickett	Thornton
LaHood	Pombo	Thurman
Laughlin	Pomeroy	Tiahrt
Lewis (CA)	Quillen	Torres
Lewis (KY)	Richardson	Torricelli
Lightfoot	Roberts	Traficant
Linder	Rogers	Visclosky
Livingston	Rohrabacher	Volkmer
Longley	Rose	Vucanovich
Lucas	Royce	Walker
Manton	Salmon	Walsh
Manzullo	Saxton	Ward
Martinez	Scarborough	Waters
Matsui	Schaefer	Watts (OK)
McCollum	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
McCrery	Seastrand	Weller
McHugh	Shaw	Whitfield
McIntosh	Skeen	Wicker
McKeon	Skelton	Wilson
Meek	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Metcalf	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Meyers	Solomon	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—12

Allard	McDade	Reynolds
Bishop	McKinney	Sisisky
Cox	Moakley	Tucker
Maloney	Morella	Waldholtz

□ 1254

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Waldholtz for, with Mr. Cox of California against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the next order of business is the consideration of one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 60 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 37.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 28, line 11, strike "\$13,110,335,000" and insert "\$12,110,335,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to lose big for a number of reasons, I believe. No. 1, the F-22, which I am trying to delay, is largely built in the home State of the Speaker. Second, there are contracts for this program in 48 States. Under those circumstances, I have infinite confidence in the capacity of this House to make the wrong decision.

Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge every single Member, especially

those who just voted to keep the B-2, I want to urge them to remember that having just voted to keep the B-2, they have no rational choice if they are serious about retaining the B-2 in the budget. They have no rational choice but to vote to delay the F-22, because if they do not, there simply will not be room in the defense budget for the B-2 or a lot of other things.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I would especially urge us all to take a look at the votes of those who vote both for the B-2 and the F-22, because they are clearly not serious about sticking to the budget resolution.

This amendment would cut \$1 billion out of the \$2.3 billion being appropriated for the F-22. It would delay that program by 5 years.

Why do I do that? It is very simple. The F-22 is meant to replace the F-15. This F-15 is the finest fighter aircraft in the world, and right now we have more than 700 of them. The GAO has told us that the F-15 will be fully capable at least to the year 2015, yet the Air Force wants to spend over \$70 billion to buy 442 F-22's. The GAO is urging that we have a 7-year delay.

This amendment simply says, "Let us have a 5-year delay in that program". It seems to me it is eminently sensible. We will be told that there are new threats out there to our air superiority, because other countries have some fighters that are roughly comparable to the F-15. I would ask Members to remember that some of the countries who have them are Switzerland, Israel, France, Britain, Italy, Argentina, Brazil, hardly countries that represent a threat to us. For the few countries who do, such as Iraq and North Korea, I would suggest they learned in Desert Storm that merely having a few capable aircraft does not at all mean that you can match our military superiority by the time that we take into account our training, our superior manpower, and our additional complementary weapons systems such as the AWACS.

What I would say, Mr. Chairman, is very simple. If we want to save money, if we want to listen to the GAO on how to do so, if we want to avoid buying an airplane probably a decade sooner than we have to do it, we will vote for this amendment. This amendment does not kill the F-22 Program. All it does is delay it for 5 years: it saves \$1 billion. It seems to me, given the crunch in both the defense budget and the rest of the budget, it makes eminently good sense. I urge Members to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a good friend back home in my district, his name is Bob Schultz. He went ashore with the Marine Corps, the 2d Marine Division, in Tarawa more than 50 years ago. As we have talked about that many, many times, he keeps coming back to the fact that when an American goes ashore on an amphibious landing, what he hopes for is that our troops control the air and not the enemy, so they might have a good chance of surviving the amphibious landing.

One of the Marine Corps Commandants, P.X. Kelly, made the same point in testimony before our subcommittee, that the first thing that a Marine wants is for an American force to control the air. The F-22 is going to be an air superiority fighter.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is correct; the F-15 is an outstanding aircraft. The F-16, the F-15, the F-18 are all good airplanes. However, as the future gets closer and closer, those airplanes get older and older. The technology is not as good today as it will be when the F-22 comes on board. If we take the \$1 billion the gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about from this program, we do not cancel the program, we do not stop the F-22, we still going to have the F-22, and the gentleman from Wisconsin concedes that. What we are going to do is add billions of dollars to the cost, because the longer that we drag out the program, the more the program costs.

Members do not have to take my word for it. Look back at every aircraft production program we have had. Every time we delay it or drag it out, it costs more money; we all understand we are going to have the F-22 so how do we get it the most cost-effective way? That is to provide the money now, as the Air Force wants to do, rather than dragging it out for 5 years and adding to the cost and getting nothing for that additional cost.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the statement made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for whom I have a great deal of respect.

The fact of the matter is that this airplane is designed for the wrong threat. It is the wrong design. We have a situation where this plane was designed to combat the future Soviet air threat. It was designed to combat the serious investment that the Russians were threatening to make in their air defense system. The F-22 is not a plane that can defend against the kinds of attacks that Sean O'Grady faced when he ended up being shot out of the sky, because of the threats posed by SAM missiles.

If we are truly interested in protecting American pilots, the F-22 is simply not the aircraft we ought to build. The truth of the matter is that if we are going to be concerned about the air threat to this country, the F-16 is the

plane that needs to be dealt with. The F-16 is a low technology plane. We own hundreds. It is also a very old aircraft. Sometime, according to the Air Force's own estimate, within the next 5 or 6 years, we are going to have to start replacing them by the hundreds. We do not ever have a design for the replacement of the F-16.

What we have done is gone out and taken a design that was conceived to protect the American people from the Soviet air attack, and we have twisted and cajoled that design into an airplane that is supposed to defend us against the kinds of attacks that we are seeing in Bosnia, in Iran or potentially Iraq, or other countries that potentially threaten the United States today. It is simply not the kind of threat that the F-22 is designed to protect us from.

Therefore, rather than spend good money after bad, that is the argument that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] put forth. That is we have already sunk money into the production. But that does not mean we should continue to spend good money after bad. It means we ought to design a plane that deals with the very real threat that we face as a country in the future.

The first and foremost priority is the replacement of the F-16. The second priority is the high end fighter. The high end fighter must be able to achieve success in attacks coming from ground launched missiles and from air launched missiles. That is not what the F-22 is designed to achieve, so why in God's name are we going to spend \$74 billion, after we have just voted to spend an additional \$30 billion on the B-2, why would we possibly spend another \$74 billion on a design that is not going to meet the real threat we face in the world today?

I think we ought to protect our pilots. I think we have to have a strong national defense. However, I think we ought to take the time to make certain that if we are going to spend \$74 billion of the U.S. taxpayers' funds, we spend it on the kind of plane we need. That is simply not what is being accomplished by voting for the F-22.

I would hope that the Congress of the United States does not simply follow in lockstep simply because the dollars have already been appropriated to get this thing to a point where it is close to production. Rather, we would make a fundamental assessment of what the real needs are. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] pointed out we simply do not have the money in the budget to fund both the B-2 bomber and the F-22. I talked to senior people in the Air Force just this morning and they said they simply do not have the funds necessary to accomplish both.

If we have to make a choice, the fact of the matter is that we need to vote against the B-2 aircraft, and we ought to redesign the F-22. Let's make it into the kind of aircraft that meets the types of threats we are going to face in the future, and use the funds we have

to increase the capability of the F-15 for the next few years. That will accomplish the goals that I think the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is looking to accomplish. The alternative is simply throwing good money after bad, which is what will happen if we build the F-22 as we see it today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 8 minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the F-22 is about preserving our freedom and liberty well into the next century, this is about air-supremacy.

My colleagues we must never forget that the price of freedom is not cheap. Americans have paid the price on the beaches of Normandy and Okinawa, in the desert heat of North Africa and the frigid cold of Korea, in the jungles of New Guinea and Vietnam. The price we have paid has been very high. Let no one say we cannot afford the F-22. We cannot afford not to have the F-22. An unwise and ill-conceived budget cut today will be paid for with American blood tomorrow. This is a cost none of us should be willing to pay.

The F-22 is a revolutionary weapon. It will guarantee our future security and deter aggression. It will save American lives. The choice should be crystal clear. Air superiority will play a role in America's future security. Air superiority is essential to project American power and minimize casualties. Air superiority will keep the peace. The F-22 is needed. The F-22 is our fighter of the future. We need it.

The amendment's supporters have done a good job presenting their case. They have chosen the right words, the correct arguments, and the proper phrases to demonstrate why we should stop funding the F-22. However, ultimately their words, their arguments, and their phrases fail. We cannot win wars with words, we cannot deter aggression with arguments, and we cannot live securely protected by phrases. We need a strong military; we need the best weapons. We need the F-22. My colleagues please join me in voting for peace, in voting for America's future, please join me in rejecting this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

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

Mr. Chairman, we heard a few moments ago about a GAO report that the F-15 fighter will suffice to maintain air superiority for this great land of ours

well into the 21st century. I would challenge GAO, in the year 2015, if they think the F-15, as great a fighter as it is today, will maintain air superiority against the advances in technology that will in fact have come about for our adversaries and potential adversaries, I challenge them to ride in those F-15's in combat missions in the year 2015. I do not think we will find any takers. We will not find any takers because, as magnificent an aircraft as the F-15 is, and I have flown in them, it will not be adequate, neither through its air frame nor through its electronic countermeasures, to sustain air superiority into the year 2015.

We need the F-22, this country needs the F-22, our friends overseas need the F-22. If we stop or delay production, we will pay more for getting less in the years to come. It makes good economic sense. We need it. Vote for it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the other distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin. By slowing the development of the F-22 we unnecessarily put this Nation's national security at risk. We send the wrong message to the men and women who will be protected by this system in the future, and we will add significant costs to the taxpayer.

As a Member of this body and a first term member of the Committee on National Security, I have taken on a responsibility to this Chamber to assess and respond to the risks posed to the people of this country. To that end, I have come to learn in vivid detail the threats that remain, even in the wake of the cold war. In this critical year when we reevaluate our defense priorities, Members are asked to consider our present state of readiness and to put in place the systems that will ensure our future dominance. Mr. Chairman, the future is the F-22.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that our colleagues send a message to the American people that we will protect your freedom at a price that we can afford. Send the message to our brave servicemembers that "We are committed to your safety, and we will equip you with the most advanced weapons available." I urge the rejection of this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for his remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, we are told this amendment to cut \$1 billion is going to cost money. The fact is the amendment saves \$1 billion. The fact is that the GAO, the General Accounting Office, says we ought to delay the purchase of these planes for 7 years. All this amendment does is delay it for 5.

We have heard a couple of speakers from Georgia, where this baby is going

to be built, tell us that our friends abroad, our foreign friends, need the F-22. I find that argument ironic, because one of the arguments being used by the supporters of the F-22 is that they are saying "Well, we have to build the F-22 because we have sold so many F-16's to our allies around the world that we now have to buy the F-22 to stay ahead of the threat from our own allies, because we sold too many planes abroad."

□ 1315

I find that argument coming back and meeting itself. I also find it interesting that the president of Lockheed, the company who is going to build this, has already been saying that he is going to be selling this baby at the Paris Air Show next year.

That tells me this is in the budget for purposes of promoting military sales, to increase the profitability of military contractors, and they have been careful to subcontract this baby over 48 States in the Union. That does not tell me much at all about the need for this in order to maintain U.S. air superiority.

Very clearly we have a huge lead and we have a huge domination over every other military force in the world, and we will continue to do so until well into the next century. There is absolutely no reason to refuse to save \$1 billion.

We ought to take the advice of the GAO, delay this program. If you do not do that, you do not understand the rest of the content of the budget. No one who voted to preserve the B-2 can afford to vote to keep this F-22 on purchase schedule, because if you do, there will simply not be any room for it and the vote you just cast did not mean anything.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], a member of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised that we are on the floor today attacking the F-22 Advanced Tactical Fighter Program. The Air Force has said that this is the most sophisticated and yet the best program that it has managed in many, many years.

I have had Darleen Druyun, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, up to the office. She feels, as the contractors also feel, that this program is moving along very, very smoothly. The one thing they are concerned about is, if Congress makes a major reduction in the funding profile for this, that you will have a delay, a major delay, in the contract, and it has already stretched out too far as far as I am concerned.

I believe that you could move this program forward more rapidly. People say, "Well, we don't have enough money to do this." Well, I would take issue with that.

This year and last year, I asked our very able staff on the Defense Subcommittee how much did we cut out just in every line item, going through this budget as we do in enormous detail, and the same number came up, and that is about \$3.5 billion. The low-priority items are cut out by the Defense Subcommittee when doing our oversight responsibility.

I believe with that, and if we supplemented the C-17 with a nondevelopmental aircraft, we could not only fund the F-22 but we could also fund the B-2. I also think we have got to make priority decisions. Any administration has to decide what are the most important things for the future.

The Air Force has determined in its judgment that the F-22 is its most important priority. Sometimes I disagree with their priorities, as we noted in the previous vote, but I think this is a program that is going forward very well. It is a model of stealth technology and high technology. It is the kind of weapon that we are going to need in the future.

There are a lot of other systems, by the way, that I would rate as much lower priority, and if we have to make some hard tough decisions down the road, we ought to look at those systems that are basically nonstealthy. The F-22 of course is stealthy and it is the best technology for the future.

I would say let us stay with this program, let us keep it moving ahead. I would urge my colleagues to reject the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 293, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 640]

AYES—126

Abercrombie	Dixon	Johnson (SD)
Ackerman	Doyle	Johnston
Andrews	Duncan	Kanjorski
Barcia	Durbin	Kennedy (MA)
Barrett (WI)	Ehlers	Kildee
Becerra	Engel	Klecicka
Beilenson	Eshoo	Klug
Berman	Evans	Lewis (GA)
Bonior	Farr	Lincoln
Borski	Fattah	LoBiondo
Brown (CA)	Fields (LA)	Lofgren
Brown (OH)	Filner	Lowe
Camp	Flake	Luther
Cardin	Foglietta	Markey
Clay	Ford	Matsui
Clayton	Fox	McDermott
Collins (IL)	Frank (MA)	McHale
Collins (MI)	Franks (NJ)	McInnis
Condit	Furse	Meehan
Conyers	Gephardt	Menendez
Cooley	Gutierrez	Mfume
Coyne	Hilliard	Miller (CA)
Creameans	Hinche	Minge
Danner	Hoekstra	Mink
DeFazio	Hoke	Moran
Dellums	Jefferson	Nadler

Oberstar	Roukema	Stupak
Obey	Royal-Allard	Thornton
Olver	Royce	Torres
Owens	Rush	Upton
Pallone	Sabo	Velázquez
Payne (NJ)	Sanders	Vento
Pelosi	Sawyer	Volkmer
Peterson (MN)	Schroeder	Waters
Petri	Schumer	Watt (NC)
Poshard	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Rahall	Serrano	Williams
Ramstad	Shays	Woolsey
Rangel	Slaughter	Wyden
Rivers	Stark	Wynn
Rohrabacher	Stokes	Yates
Roth	Studds	Zimmer

NOES—293

Allard	Ensign	Latham
Archer	Everett	LaTourrette
Armey	Ewing	Laughlin
Bachus	Fawell	Lazio
Baessler	Fazio	Leach
Baker (CA)	Fields (TX)	Levin
Baker (LA)	Flanagan	Lewis (CA)
Baldacci	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Ballenger	Forbes	Lightfoot
Barr	Fowler	Linder
Barrett (NE)	Franks (CT)	Lipinski
Bartlett	Frelinghuysen	Livingston
Barton	Frisa	Longley
Bass	Frost	Lucas
Bateman	Funderburk	Manton
Bentsen	Gallegly	Manzullo
Bereuter	Ganske	Martinez
Bevill	Gejdenson	Martini
Bilbray	Gekas	Mascara
Bilirakis	Geren	McCarthy
Bliley	Gibbons	McCullum
Blute	Gilchrest	McCreery
Boehlert	Gillmor	McDade
Boehner	Gonzalez	McHugh
Bonilla	Goodlatte	McIntosh
Bono	Goodling	McKeon
Boucher	Gordon	McNulty
Brewster	Goss	Meek
Browder	Graham	Metcalf
Brown (FL)	Green	Meyers
Brownback	Greenwood	Mica
Bryant (TN)	Gunderson	Miller (FL)
Bryant (TX)	Gutknecht	Mineta
Bunn	Hall (OH)	Molinari
Bunning	Hall (TX)	Mollohan
Burr	Hamilton	Montgomery
Burton	Hancock	Moorhead
Buyer	Hansen	Murtha
Callahan	Harman	Myers
Calvert	Hastert	Myrick
Canady	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Castle	Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt
Chabot	Hayes	Neumann
Chambliss	Hayworth	Ney
Chapman	Hefley	Norwood
Chenoweth	Hefner	Ortiz
Christensen	Heineman	Orton
Chrysler	Herger	Packard
Clement	Hilleary	Parker
Clinger	Hobson	Pastor
Clyburn	Holden	Paxon
Coble	Horn	Payne (VA)
Coburn	Hostettler	Peterson (FL)
Coleman	Houghton	Pickett
Collins (GA)	Hoyer	Pombo
Combest	Hunter	Pomeroy
Costello	Hutchinson	Porter
Cramer	Hyde	Portman
Crane	Inglis	Pryce
Crapo	Istook	Quillen
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Quinn
Cunningham	Jacobs	Radanovich
Davis	Johnson (CT)	Reed
de la Garza	Johnson, E. B.	Regula
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Richardson
DeLauro	Jones	Riggs
DeLay	Kaptur	Roberts
Deutsch	Kasich	Roemer
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Rogers
Dickey	Kennedy (RI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dicks	Kennelly	Rose
Doggett	Kim	Salmon
Dooley	King	Sanford
Doolittle	Kingston	Saxton
Dornan	Klink	Scarborough
Dreier	Knollenberg	Schaefer
Dunn	Kolbe	Schiff
Edwards	LaFalce	Scott
Ehrlich	LaHood	Seastrand
Emerson	Lantos	Shadegg
English	Largent	Shaw

Shuster	Tanner	Walsh
Skaggs	Tate	Wamp
Skeen	Tauzin	Ward
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Tejeda	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Thomas	Weller
Smith (WA)	Thompson	White
Solomon	Thornberry	Whitfield
Souder	Thurman	Wicker
Spence	Tiahrt	Wilson
Spratt	Torkildsen	Wise
Stearns	Torricelli	Wolf
Stenholm	Traficant	Young (AK)
Stockman	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Stump	Vucanovich	Zeliff
Talent	Walker	

## NOT VOTING—15

Bishop	McKinney	Reynolds
Cox	Moakley	Sisisky
Dingell	Morella	Towns
Gilman	Nussle	Tucker
Maloney	Oxley	Waldholtz

□ 1339

Mr. NEAL and Mr. SCOTT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CAMP, VOLKMER, FOX of Pennsylvania, HILLIARD, CREMEANS, and BEILENSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 639, had I been present I would have voted "no." My pager failed to go off because of a battery failure.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is entitled to offer amendment 58, amendment 59, or amendment 61 at this time. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to offer any of these amendments?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I can read the handwriting on the wall. I will not be offering the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of today, it is now in order for the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] to offer amendment No. 3 or amendment No. 15 and, if offered, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] to offer amendment No. 48 as a substitute therefor.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The text of the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 48 offered by Ms. DELAURO as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term; or

(2) in the case of a medical treatment or other facility of the Department of Defense located outside the United States, any cost incurred by the United States in connection with such procedure will be reimbursed from private funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] each will be recognized for 15 minutes on the amendment and on the substitute.

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

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

Today's debate is very simple, Mr. Chairman. In fact, we had this exact same debate on June 15 of this year when the House considered the Defense authorization bill. I had inserted language in that bill to restore the Reagan-Bush policy which prohibited federally funded, overseas military treatment facilities from providing abortions. When the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] offered an amendment to strike that provision, it was defeated by a bipartisan vote of 196 to 230. Today's vote is no different. I repeat, Mr. Chairman. Today's vote is virtually identical to the one we had during debate over the DOD authorization bill.

I understand the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is going to once again attempt to gut my amendment. The DeLauro substitute would codify the proabortion executive memorandum issued by Clinton on his first working day in office, January 22, 1993. Roe versus Wade anniversary. It was on that day that Clinton overturned the Reagan-Bush policy which prohibited federally funded, overseas military hospitals from being used as abortion centers. So if you voted "no" on DeLauro during debate over the DOD authorization bill, then you should vote "no" on today's DeLauro substitute.

Mr. Chairman, taxpayers who oppose abortion should not be forced to subsidize it. But that is exactly what is occurring when we permit abortions to be performed in military medical facilities. Supporters of the DeLauro substitute will tell you that no Federal money is involved because the procedure

is paid for by the woman. What they do not tell you is that military hospitals are federally funded facilities paid for with U.S. tax dollars.

Everything in these facilities, from the electricity to the equipment, even the building itself, is taxpayer financed. And while there has been strong reluctance among military doctors to perform any abortions, the Pentagon has made it clear that they intend to find a way to implement the policy—possibly by hiring civilian ob/gyns to perform the abortion. This raises additional objections regarding the use of taxpayer money to subsidize abortions in the military.

Supporters of the DeLauro substitute will also argue that President Clinton's pro-abortion executive memorandum was intended to ensure that servicewomen, military spouses, and dependents have access to abortion comparable with that of women in the United States. They also argue that Western nations have strict limits on obtaining abortions and that their medical facilities are unsafe and unsanitary. This, Mr. Chairman, is untrue. First, the military must respect the laws of host nations regarding abortion—this includes laws restricting or prohibiting abortion. Second, women seeking an abortion can go where they have been going for years—local facilities, such as those in Germany, which are comparable to United States abortuaries and they kill the fetuses at less expense.

Mr. Chairman, military hospitals are intended to be places that nurture, heal, and protect all patients—born and preborn. I urge my colleagues to vote down the DeLauro substitute and vote in favor of the Dornan amendment that I am offering.

My amendment would restore the Reagan-Bush policy prohibiting the use of funds to administer any policy that permits the performance of abortions at medical treatment or other facilities of the Department of Defense—except when the life of the mother would be in danger. Its enactment would not only save precious lives, it would disassociate taxpayers from the killing business. And while we have already included similar language in the DOD authorization bill, there are no guarantees that Clinton will sign that bill into law. So my amendment today is nothing more than an insurance policy for taxpayers. It would ensure that in fiscal year 1996, American tax dollars are not used in any way to subsidize abortion in the military. So again, I ask my colleagues who voted "no" on the DeLauro amendment to the DOD authorization bill to once again vote "no" on today's DeLauro substitute. Let's return our military medical facilities to the status of institutions dedicated exclusively to healing. Mr. Chairman, I've just returned from visiting our military folks in Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia, and Albania, and at our bases at Naples, Aviano, and

Brindisi and when I brought this abortion issue up everyone—every single military man and woman said, "Please, no money for abortion!" Please vote "no" on DeLauro and vote "yes" on Dornan. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes, 5 seconds.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan substitute amendment on behalf of myself, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD]. Our substitute amendment restores equal access to safe medical treatment for military servicewomen and military dependents who are stationed overseas. It corrects language in the Dornan amendment which would ban the Department of Defense from using funds in the bill to administer any policy that permits abortions to be performed at medical facilities except when the life of the mother is in danger.

Mr. Chairman, the Dornan amendment is an assault on the woman's right to choose. It jeopardizes access to safe medical care for millions of women who rely on military hospitals overseas. Women who joined the military to protect our rights should not have to check their constitutional rights at the border.

The Dornan amendment offered today mirrors language in the Defense authorization bill that denies access to legal abortion services for all women utilizing medical facilities outside the United States. This is an outrage. Women and their families have a constitutional right to these services, and their constitutional rights should not be thrown aside while they are under the care of military hospitals.

Let me emphasize several points about our substitute amendment.

First of all, the substitute amendment would not allow Federal funds to be used to pay for abortions, not allow Federal funds. The Dornan amendment overturns current policy that allows women to use their own funds.

Let me repeat that. They use their own funds to pay for abortions in overseas military hospitals. These patients are charged the full reimbursement rate for same-day surgery, more than the cost, more than the cost of abortion services at private facilities in this country, in order to ensure that there is no Federal funding involved.

Second, the substitute protects current policy under which no medical providers are forced to perform abortions due to the conscience clause that exists in the military services. No medical personnel would be forced to participate in or perform these services. It preserves the conscience clause.

Third, this is not a new policy. Privately funded abortions were allowed at military facilities from 1973 to 1988, including all, but a few, months of the Reagan administration, and they have been permitted again since President Clinton's executive order of January 19, 1993. The ban that existed from October 1988 to January 1993 was the exception.

The Dornan amendment is a direct attack on the rights of the American women who virtually work in serving our country valiantly and have put their lives on the line for this country ever single day. It is a backward step, and we must not allow it to move forward.

I urge my colleagues to ensure that our female military personnel and their military dependents have access to safe and legal medical care. Vote for our substitute and defeat the Dornan amendment.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], an Army doctor still active in the Reserve and still actively practicing his profession of delivering babies.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the DeLauro amendment and speak in support of the Dornan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, prior to coming here to the Congress I was practicing medicine in Florida, and prior to practicing medicine in Florida I was in the Army, in the Army Medical Corps. Indeed I was in the Army during the early years of the 1980's when Reagan administration policies went into effect where we were not allowed to provide abortion services in military facilities, and, as a physician, I can say that we like the policy.

Most physicians do not like to get involved with the business of abortion, and that is because the vast majority of physicians become physicians because they want to be healers. They respect human life, and they recognize that performing abortion is a direct contradiction to that principle, a value that actually drew them into medicine. Indeed most physicians still take a Hippocratic Oath where they are asked to do no harm, but performing an abortion is a direct contradiction of that, as well as it is a direct contradiction of the very principle upon which our Nation was founded when Thomas Jefferson said that we are endowed by a Creator with inalienable rights to include the right to life. As a former Army physician, Mr. Chairman, I can tell my colleagues that we very much appreciated the support that we received from the Reagan administration in this area in that we did not have to involve ourselves.

A significant percentage of the American people are very strongly opposed to abortion. They feel that it is morally wrong to use taxpayer funding, even if it is indirect, to support this

practice I think is very wrong, and I rise in support of the gentleman from California's position and in opposition to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] for yielding this time to me. I hope everyone votes for her amendment.

Let me tell my colleagues first of all DOD has a conscience clause. DOD has a parental-consent clause that they vigorously enforce. There have been only about 10 abortions that people paid for with their own money in the entire time this was in practice.

When we send people overseas, this is not voluntary. We order them to go overseas, and no one else would tolerate what the Dornan amendment is trying to do. If we said, "When you go overseas, you can no longer have your free speech, thank you very much; when you go overseas, you can no longer have your freedom of religion, we don't want you practicing religion that would offend anybody, we don't want you to have the right to assemble with different groups, we don't want you \* \* \*," people would go crazy. They would say this is our front line of defense defending our rights, and, no matter whether we agree with what they say, or who they assemble with, or what their religion is, we do not want to have that enforced on them just because they are offshore defending our wonderful rights.

Well, that is what my colleagues are doing today. They are doing that to women if they vote for Dornan. Vote "no" on Dornan, and vote for the DeLauro substitute.

When we station military personnel overseas, we do not ask them to give up their rights to free speech, to exercise their religion, to assemble. We don't require them to give up their legal protections against illegal searches and seizures. They still have the right to a speedy and public trial, a right to an attorney. The Dornan amendment asks military women and dependents to give up their legally protected right to choose.

This bill does not force anyone to be involved in an abortion against their will. Currently, active duty women stationed overseas are guaranteed the same rights that they would have if they were stationed stateside because they are allowed to pay the costs of an abortion in a military hospital out of their own pocket. Currently, no DOD funds can be used to fund abortions unless the life of the mother is in danger. Currently, no medical personnel are required to perform an abortion if they object to doing so, unless the life of the mother is at risk. Currently, the DOD cannot perform abortions in countries where that procedure is illegal.

The ban on privately paid abortions for military women overseas strips women of the very rights they were recruited to protect. The ban on abortions at military hospitals is unfair, dangerous, and discriminatory to military personnel. The ban doesn't even allow for abortions in cases where the fetus is so malformed that it will not survive birth.

I urge you to oppose the Dornan amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, imagine, if you will, a female captain serving with distinction in the Air Force at Kunsan Air Base, Korea. Brutally raped off-base, she receives medical and psychological treatment there, and may even receive more sophisticated OB/GYN treatment at the United States medical facility at Osan or at Yakota Air Base, Japan.

If, however, she discovers later that she is pregnant as the result of the rape, she will be unable to terminate the pregnancy at the Air Force hospital at Osan or Yakota if the Dornan amendment is adopted. And she'd be endangering her life if she went to a substandard local off-base facility.

In fact, this woman would be treated as a second-class citizen—forced to travel on her own back to the United States to obtain the kind of medical procedure guaranteed under our Constitution to all other American women.

For women, the Dornan amendment makes wearing a uniform a liability. That, indeed, may be the recruiting poster designed by the gentleman from California. "Abandon your rights, all ye women who enter."

I strongly support the amendment of my colleague from Connecticut to affirm current policy. Under current policy, neither Federal funds are used nor are health professionals required to perform abortions. Under current policy, expenses are borne entirely by the servicewoman or dependent.

This is a matter of fairness and equal access to medical facilities. Servicewomen and military dependents stationed overseas don't want or expect special treatment or special rights, only the ability to exercise rights guaranteed by Roe versus Wade, at medical facilities convenient to their post.

Remember the female captain stationed in Korea or another country far from the United States. The free exercise of her constitutional rights should not be inversely related to her distance from America's shores.

Vote for the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro amendment, which strikes language that bars military women and dependents overseas from purchasing abortion services with their own money. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to reject the Dornan amendment.

The Dornan amendment goes much further than simply limiting the use of Government funds. It actually bars military women and dependents from

using their own money to pay for abortion services at military bases, just as they would use their own funds to pay for those services if they were in the United States.

The Dornan amendment also puts the health of our military women at risk. Many of these women are stationed in countries where there is no access to safe and legal abortions outside of the military hospitals. A woman forced to seek an abortion to local facilities, or forced to wait to travel to acquire safe abortion services, faces tremendous health risks.

It is unimaginable to me and to the American people that we would reward American servicewomen who have volunteered to serve this Nation by violating their constitutional right to a safe abortion. I urge you to support the DeLauro amendment and to reject the Dornan amendment.

□ 1400

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Dornan amendment and in strong support of the DeLauro substitute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Dornan amendment makes women in the military second-class citizens. Our military personnel should not have to risk their health nor sacrifice their civil rights when they serve their country. A ban on women getting abortions in military facilities overseas, even if they pay for it themselves, is discriminatory, and it prohibits women from exercising their legal rights simply because they are stationed overseas. Women stationed overseas are often situated in areas where local facilities are inadequate or they are unavailable.

The DeLauro amendment protects military women's health. We should do no less, Mr. Chairman. We should vote for this DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Today, after all the pious speeches about the honor and bravery and sacrifice of Americans who wear the uniform of this great Nation overseas, we have reached one of those defining moments of truth.

The question is, Should brave Americans ready to lay down their lives in

the defense of our Nation have the same fundamental rights as all other citizens? Can a woman in the service of her country go to a hospital and pay her own money for a legal and constitutionally protected abortion in a safe and clean American hospital?

It is time to show the voters what we really think of our American servicewomen. Do we genuinely respect and honor them enough to allow them the same rights any civilian has? Or are all our statements of respect and gratitude to our servicewomen just more cheap rhetoric for use during campaign season or when we want the taxpayers to buy a weapons system the Pentagon says it doesn't need?

Let's honor our servicewomen with more than just hollow rhetoric; let's respect their fundamental rights. Vote "yes" on the DeLauro substitute.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with regret that this House is once again using important debate time reserved for national security concerns to address the socially divisive issue of abortion. We have been through this same debate several times in committee and on the floor. In fact, the Senate addressed this question and voted to delete the restriction in the Armed Services Committee. I urge my colleagues to do the same by supporting the DeLauro amendment.

The language in this bill relegates our servicewomen and the wives of servicemen to the status of second-class citizens. It also represents congressional tampering at its worst. A woman's right to choose is the law of the land—whether we agree or not. Congress has no right to deny a basic law to women simply because they are stationed abroad. The DeLauro amendment would apply current law to the military. Only private money could be used for abortion services, and no Federal money could be used. As a Hyde amendment supporter, I agree with that policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject the social agenda embodied in this language. Support current military policy—vote for the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the last speaker, said we were wasting precious national security time. Mr. Chairman, we lost 618,000 American lives in the Civil War between the States; we lost about 312,000 precious lives in World War II. Together that does not equal 1 million. We kill 1.5 million American babies in their mothers' wombs every year. The death toll, since the fraudulent, based-on-a-lie Roe versus Wade decision, we have killed about 35 million babies.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent use of time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

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

Mr. Chairman, we need to be clear about a number of matters with regard to this amendment. The first and most important is no Federal funds will be used to provide these services. The substitute that is being offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut relates only to the use of private funds. No medical providers will be forced to perform this procedure. No one will be forced to perform this procedure. All branches of the military have conscience clause provisions that permit medical personnel who have moral, religious, or ethical objections to this procedure to opt not to perform it. The substitute preserves this clause.

Mr. Chairman, this will keep military servicewomen and military dependents out of back alleys by allowing them access to safe, legal, and comprehensive reproductive services. I urge support of the DeLauro amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Dornan amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill.

As my colleague from California has accurately pointed out, we have already had this debate and the proponents of forcing taxpayers to pay for overseas abortions came out on the losing end.

The facts today are no different than they were 2½ months ago. There is no reason why the American people—most of whom oppose abortion on demand—should be compelled to pay for abortions overseas and no reason for the U.S. Government to sponsor these abortions.

The Dornan language merely goes back to the more rationale and humane policy that was in place during the Reagan-Bush years. That policy prohibited federally funded, overseas military treatment facilities from providing abortions. Moreover, that policy allowed DOD medical facilities to do what they are supported to do—provide the services necessary to heal the sick and injured.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dornan amendment.

Mrs. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate that there are no public funds involved in this effort. It is the funds, private funds, of the women who serve in our military who serve overseas, no public funding.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the DeLauro amendment to allow women in the armed services access to safe abortions abroad at their own expense.

I respect my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who oppose abortion for moral or religious reasons. But this summer I have witnessed an unprecedented move by moderate Republicans to join with their conservative colleagues in an all-out attack on women's reproductive rights. Members who for years have professed to support the rights to choose have voted to deny entire groups of women—like federal employees—access to safe abortions. Time and time again they have sacrificed women's constitutional rights for political, not moral ambitions.

Allowing military women to pay for their own abortions abroad is not a radical idea. The DeLauro amendment will simply continue to permit women who are voluntarily serving our country to practice the right to choose and to pay for that right themselves.

Please do not continue to sacrifice women's constitutional rights in the Republican fight to maintain control of Congress. Women don't deserve to be the losers in the political battle between Democrats and Republicans in Washington.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER], my distinguished colleague from the Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Dornan amendment and in opposition to the DeLauro amendment. Mr. Chairman, in the Defense authorization bill passed earlier this year this Congress placed limits on the use of U.S. military facilities for the practice of abortion. We now face this very same issue in the context of appropriations.

Those who oppose these limits argue that their position is simply a "matter of fairness." Despite my questioning whether we can have any substantive discussion of fairness without including the preborn, and despite my profound disagreement with the Supreme Court's reasoning in the Roe versus Wade decision, I want to concentrate on what I see as the real issue at hand.

The Supreme Court has told us that we have to allow the killing of preborn children. It has not, however, told us that Government has an obligation to provide this service. The DeLauro amendment, I believe, would obligate the United States to make sure abortion services and facilities are available at U.S. military bases.

There are many reasons why we should not obligate the military to provide facilities and services for abortion. For example, despite the assurances from the other side, I believe it is hard to argue there is no subsidy of abortion by U.S. taxpayers in this case. I believe there is a subsidy, though it may be indirect, because everything in our military medical systems is taxpayer-funded—from the doctor's education and availability, to the elec-

tricity powering the facility's equipment, to the very building itself.

In addition, abortion—while declared legal by the Supreme Court—remains a very divisive practice, and allowing abortions to be performed on military installations would bring that discord and dissension right onto our military bases, complete with pickets and the like.

Some would also argue that it is especially offensive to make the military—an institution dedicated to preserving innocent life by deterring aggression—the provider of a procedure that ends innocent life.

While it is offensive, I think that the core principle at issue today—whether the Government is obligated to provide a right—goes beyond the unique circumstances of the military. The freedom of the press guaranteed by the first amendment, for example, does not obligate the Federal Government to provide every interested American with a printing press. Pushing this notion further, I ask, should we allow military facilities to be used for prostitution where it is otherwise legal? I think not.

Congress has the clear responsibility under the Constitution to provide for the rules and regulations of the military. We must not make it the policy of the United States to use its military facilities to destroy an innocent preborn life.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I will vote in favor of the Dornan amendment and against the DeLauro amendment. I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government is obligated to honor the constitutional rights of women who serve in the military overseas. The Dornan amendment denies their constitutional rights.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment to preserve the right to choose for women who serve our country in the military. And I rise in strong opposition to the Dornan amendment to take away that right.

The Dornan amendment is yet another step in the continuing stealth campaign to take away the right to choose for all women. The anti-choice forces in this House already have voted to take away that right for poor women and for women who work for the Federal Government.

But I find the Dornan amendment to be especially offensive because it takes away the freedom to choose from women who risk their lives to defend all of our freedoms. The Dornan amendment makes a mockery of our Constitution and the right to freedom, fairness, and equality enshrined in it.

Once again, I challenge those who oppose a woman's right to choose to have the courage of their convictions and bring it up for an up-or-down vote.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the saddest debates that we have on this floor, usually twice a year. Since we did away with the draft we asked for volunteers, and of course in the modern era that means we have many women serving in our military. All we are talking about here is protecting and preserving their constitutional right, as has been enumerated by our Supreme Court, to use medical facilities that are clean and safe overseas should they have the tragic requirement of needing an abortion.

Mr. Chairman, this is not public funding. It is their money. The ought to be safe in the assignment of the taxpayers money.

□ 1415

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the DeLauro amendment.

I would like to remind this Congress that the Constitution applies to all Americans, including members of the Armed Forces.

Women soldiers who serve our country overseas have access to a full range of reproductive services. The DeLauro amendment allows them to use their own money in overseas hospitals.

Pass the DeLauro amendment. Protect a military woman's right to choose.

Mr. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, do you think for a moment that if men could get pregnant that we would be spending a moment here to discuss whether our men in the military would have the right to use their own money to go to military hospitals to have one of the most personal, private operations possible performed on their bodies? The answer is no.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know the circumstance of pregnancy of these women. We do not know the health circumstances that are unique to them, and the reality is this ought to be left to them. They have a constitutional right, let us support it.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who has just returned from a sterling performance in China.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding time to me.

This vote poses two simple yet fundamental questions: First, when Congress encounters one of those rare questions on which the Federal judiciary has not mandated a proabortion policy, will we have the courage to stand for innocent human life?

Second, is it consistent with the mission of our Armed Forces, a mission that is justifiable only insofar as it is designed to save and protect human lives, to be deeply involved in the enterprise of killing unborn children?

Unfortunately, on January 22, 1993, our military hospitals were turned into abortion mills by the President of the United States when he reversed a well settled prolife policy. Since then, however, and I am glad to say, many of our courageous military obstetricians and nurses and anesthesiologists around the world have refused. I say again have refused to comply with that death order. They understand that their job is to be healers first and always. They regard it as inconsistent and hypocritical to heal innocent people in one room and kill them in the next. They know a house divided against itself will not stand.

By adopting the Dornan language, this House will take its stand with these healers, these true health professionals, and bear witness to their courage and vision. DOD hospitals and health care facilities will once again be institutions exclusively dedicated to healing.

The DeLauro amendment makes a false distinction based not on what happens in an abortion, not on who does the abortion, but on who provides the cash. This amendment says, in effect, that it is moral to tear a child limb from limb as long as somebody else is paying for it. It pretends that the United States is not really taking sides if it turns its hospitals into abortion mills, provided that they break even. This distinction is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of what is at stake here, of what is at stake in every single abortion.

Mr. Chairman, the law has a teaching function. It teaches by example. If the United States chooses to turn its military hospitals into abortion mills, it sends a powerful message to women and girls that abortion is not only a choice that they are allowed under the Supreme Court's decisions, but an acceptable choice. By taking its hospitals out of the abortion business, the United States can send the opposite message—a message of healing, of compassion, of justice for each person, born and unborn.

Each of us is called upon today to take a stand one way or the other: For life or for death. The DeLauro amendment attempts to tell us that we can be neutral on this question, but this is not one of the questions on which we can remain neutral. I urge my colleagues to choose life. Please vote "no" on the DeLauro amendment and "yes" on the Dornan amendment.

Vote "yes" on the Dornan amendment, "no" on the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeLauro amendment and opposition to the Dornan

amendment. This is a very sensitive question and I certainly respect both sides. My wife and I would not choose abortion for our family. We just had a baby. My wife gave birth at age 41, but I wanted to say something. People who are opposed to abortion do not have a right, in my opinion, to force their beliefs on everybody else.

Mr. Chairman, the thing about the United States is that people have individual rights and individual freedoms. If you do not believe in abortion, then it is your right not to have one. Women in the military ought to be treated like every other citizen. They ought to have the freedom to choose.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DeLauro substitute amendment and in opposition to the Dornan amendment.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is patently unfair that American women cannot obtain medical services—medical services that are legal under the American Constitution and American laws—at American medical facilities just because these women are stationed overseas.

Our Government has long advocated the elimination of discrimination and unequal treatment. We have long advocated access to safe and sound medical services. The Dornan amendment is overtly discriminatory; it is overtly unequal and it is overtly unsafe and unsound.

This amendment is not about granting special rights to women stationed overseas. It's about fairness. It's about making sure that American women overseas are not classified as second class citizens by their Government, the Government for which they provide defense from foreign aggression.

I support the DeLauro substitute because I support women as full and equal citizens of this country. To vote otherwise, is to insult the women of America in the worst way possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] has 45 seconds remaining.

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

I would like to emphasize that this amendment is not about public funding and its is not about special treatment, it is about fairness. That is what it is about. The substitute amendment preserves the right to choose and it preserves safe health care for American military women.

Women who serve in the military to protect our rights, to protect our liberty, should not have to check those rights, their constitutional rights, at our border when they go overseas to protect us. They deserve good quality and the best medical care and they have that right under our Constitution. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan substitute amendment and to defeat the Dornan amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, every consultant who has made it to heaven or is in the other place will tell you that the first thing they learn is do not be a flip-flopper, and here is the list of how 230 people voted before. This is not a mockery to the Constitution. The mockery was aging, retired Harry Blackmun finding a right to kill innocent precious human life in the womb. I hope he has a good lawyer when he meets St. Peter.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is recognized for 1 minute and 15 seconds.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, this is more than a legal or a constitutional question, although it certainly is that. It is a moral question. I do not think anybody who claims to be human can be indifferent to the proposition that a tiny, vulnerable, defenseless unborn life is being crushed, is being destroyed, is being exterminated in an abortion and be indifferent to that. That is the one missing factor in all of the reasoned arguments on the proabortion side.

Mr. Chairman, they talk about women's rights, they talk about safe abortion, but they totally forget the invisible element, the unborn child. That is not a nothing. The term safe abortion is an oxymoron. It is terminal for the unborn child.

What is safe about being sucked out of a mother's womb and thrown away with the trash? Abortions are evil. They are not a benign neutral act. They take a human life that has been guaranteed the right to life in our Declaration of Independence as inalienable. Why is that erased in all of our contemplation?

Do not euphemize reproductive rights. There is nothing reproductive about abortion. That is reproductive denial.

Vote for Dornan against DeLauro.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, the men and women who serve as military doctors in our armed services take an oath to save and defend lives. The majority of doctors in the military do not want to participate in the willful destruction of human life. Despite the great reluctance of doctors to perform abortions—the Pentagon, under the direction of the Clinton administration, is insisting that a way be found to allow abortion on demand at our military facilities. While women seeking an abortion must pay for the procedure—having the procedure take place at a military hospital raises concerns regarding the use of taxpayer money to subsidize abortion-related expenses.

The Dornan language would insure the restoration of a Reagan-Bush policy which stated that overseas U.S. military medical facilities could not be used to perform abortions—except to save the life of the mother. Opponents of the Dornan provision may argue that many nations hosting U.S. military bases may have limits on abortion, making it difficult to obtain this procedure safely. However, the U.S. mili-

tary is bound to respect the laws of host countries including any restriction on abortions. Furthermore, United States women overseas may continue, as they have for years, to go to Germany and use facilities there that are just as safe as anywhere in the United States.

It is clear that military doctors want nothing to do with aiding the destruction of unborn children and that the majority of the American people do not want their tax dollars to subsidize abortion either directly or indirectly. We have a responsibility to ensure that our military facilities are allowed to be completely dedicated to healing people, not aiding in their destruction. I urge my colleagues to support the Dornan amendment to H.R. 2126.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the underlying Dornan amendment without intervening business or debate.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 224, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 641]

AYES—194

Abercrombie	Engel	Kelly
Ackerman	Eshoo	Kennedy (MA)
Andrews	Evans	Kennedy (RI)
Baelsler	Farr	Kennelly
Baldacci	Fattah	Klecicka
Barrett (WI)	Fawell	Klug
Bass	Fazio	Kolbe
Becerra	Fields (LA)	Lantos
Beilenson	Filner	Leach
Bentsen	Flake	Levin
Berman	Foglietta	Lewis (GA)
Boehlert	Foley	Lincoln
Bonior	Ford	Lofgren
Bono	Fowler	Longley
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Lowey
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Luther
Brown (CA)	Franks (NJ)	Markey
Brown (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Martinez
Brown (OH)	Frost	Martini
Bryant (TX)	Furse	Matsui
Cardin	Gejdenson	McCarthy
Castle	Gephardt	McDermott
Chapman	Geren	McHale
Clay	Gibbons	McHugh
Clayton	Gilchrest	McInnis
Clement	Gilman	Meehan
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Meek
Coleman	Gordon	Menendez
Collins (IL)	Green	Meyers
Collins (MI)	Greenwood	Mfume
Condit	Gunderson	Miller (CA)
Conyers	Gutierrez	Miller (FL)
Coyne	Harman	Mineta
Cramer	Hastings (FL)	Minge
Danner	Hefner	Mink
DeFazio	Hilliard	Molinari
DeLauro	Hinchev	Moran
Dellums	Horn	Nadler
Deutsch	Houghton	Obey
Dicks	Hoyer	Olver
Dixon	Jackson-Lee	Owens
Doggett	Jacobs	Pallone
Dooley	Jefferson	Pastor
Dunn	Johnson (CT)	Payne (NJ)
Durbin	Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)
Edwards	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Ehrlich	Johnston	Peterson (FL)

Petri	Schroeder
Pickett	Schumer
Pomeroy	Scott
Porter	Serrano
Pryce	Shaw
Ramstad	Shays
Rangel	Skaggs
Reed	Slaughter
Richardson	Spratt
Rivers	Stark
Rose	Stokes
Roukema	Studds
Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Rush	Thomas
Sabo	Thompson
Sanders	Thurman
Sawyer	Torkildsen
Schiff	Torres

Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Vislosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
White
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—224

Allard	Gekas	Norwood
Archer	Goodlatte	Nussle
Armey	Goodling	Oberstar
Bachus	Goss	Ortiz
Baker (CA)	Graham	Orton
Baker (LA)	Gutknecht	Oxley
Ballenger	Hall (OH)	Packard
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Parker
Barr	Hamilton	Paxon
Barrett (NE)	Hancock	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett	Hansen	Pombo
Barton	Hastert	Portman
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Poshard
Bevill	Hayes	Quillen
Bilbray	Hayworth	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hefley	Radanovich
Bliley	Heineman	Rahall
Blute	Herger	Regula
Boehner	Hilleary	Riggs
Bonilla	Hobson	Roberts
Borski	Hoekstra	Roemer
Browder	Hoke	Rogers
Brownback	Holden	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunn	Hutchinson	Roth
Bunning	Hyde	Royce
Burr	Inglis	Salmon
Burton	Istook	Sanford
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Callahan	Jones	Scarborough
Calvert	Kanjorski	Schaefer
Camp	Kaptur	Seastrand
Canady	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kildee	Shadegg
Chambliss	Kim	Shuster
Chenoweth	King	Skeen
Christensen	Kingston	Skelton
Chrysler	Klink	Smith (MI)
Clinger	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Coble	LaFalce	Smith (TX)
Coburn	LaHood	Smith (WA)
Collins (GA)	Largent	Solomon
Combest	Latham	Souder
Cooley	LaTourette	Spence
Costello	Laughlin	Stearns
Crane	Lazio	Stenholm
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Stockman
Creameans	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Cubin	Lightfoot	Stupak
Cunningham	Linder	Talent
Davis	Lipinski	Tate
de la Garza	Livingston	Tauzin
Deal	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Lucas	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Manton	Tejeda
Dickey	Manzullo	Thornberry
Doolittle	Mascara	Thornton
Dornan	McCollum	Tiahrt
Doyle	McCrary	Trafficant
Dreier	McDade	Upton
Duncan	McIntosh	Volkmer
Ehlers	McKeon	Vucanovich
Emerson	McNulty	Walker
English	Metcalf	Walsh
Ensign	Mica	Wamp
Everett	Mollohan	Watts (OK)
Ewing	Montgomery	Weldon (FL)
Fields (TX)	Moorhead	Weldon (PA)
Flanagan	Murtha	Weller
Forbes	Myers	Whitfield
Fox	Myrick	Wicker
Frisa	Neal	Wolf
Funderburk	Nethercutt	Young (AK)
Galleghy	Neumann	Young (FL)
Ganske	Ney	

NOT VOTING—16

Bateman	Cox	Gillmor
Bishop	Dingell	Hunter

Maloney Reynolds Ward  
 McKinney Siskis Wilson  
 Moakley Tucker  
 Morella Waldholtz

□ 1444

Mr. HORN, Ms. DUNN of Washington, and Mr. THOMAS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 641 on H.R. 2126 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 641.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I ask that a statement appear in the RECORD following rollcall 641 indicating that, though I was recorded as voting "aye" it was my intention to vote "no," on the amendment.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 191, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 642]

AYES—226

Allard Clinger Gallegly  
 Archer Coble Ganske  
 Army Coburn Gekas  
 Bachus Collins (GA) Gillmor  
 Baker (CA) Combest Goodlatte  
 Baker (LA) Cooley Goodling  
 Ballenger Costello Goss  
 Barcia Crane Graham  
 Barr Crapo Gutknecht  
 Barrett (NE) Cremeans Hall (OH)  
 Bartlett Cubin Hall (TX)  
 Barton Cunningham Hamilton  
 Bateman Danner Hancock  
 Bereuter Davis Hansen  
 Bevill de la Garza Hastert  
 Bilirakis Deal Hastings (WA)  
 Bliley DeLay Hayes  
 Boehner Diaz-Balart Hayworth  
 Borski Dickey Hefley  
 Browder Doolittle Heineman  
 Brownback Dornan Herger  
 Bryant (TN) Doyle Hilleary  
 Bunn Dreier Hobson  
 Bunning Duncan Hoekstra  
 Burr Ehlers Hoke  
 Burton Emerson Holden  
 Buyer English Hostettler  
 Callahan Ensign Hunter  
 Calvert Everett Hutchinson  
 Camp Ewing Hyde  
 Canady Fields (TX) Inglis  
 Chabot Flanagan Istook  
 Chambliss Forbes Johnson, Sam  
 Chenoweth Fox Jones  
 Christensen Frisa Kanjorski  
 Chrysler Funderburk Kaptur

Kasich Neal  
 Kildee Nethercutt  
 Kim Neumann  
 King Ney  
 Kingston Norwood  
 Kleczka Nussle  
 Klink Oberstar  
 Knollenberg Ortiz  
 LaFalce Orton  
 LaHood Oxley  
 Largent Packard  
 Latham Parker  
 LaTourette Paxon  
 Laughlin Peterson (MN)  
 Lazio Pombo  
 Lewis (CA) Portman  
 Lewis (KY) Poshard  
 Lightfoot Quillen  
 Linder Quinn  
 Lipinski Radanovich  
 Livingston Rahall  
 LoBiondo Regula  
 Lucas Riggs  
 Manton Roberts  
 Manzullo Roemer  
 Mascara Rogers  
 McCollum Rohrabacher  
 McCrery Ros-Lehtinen  
 McDade Royce  
 McIntosh Salmon  
 McKeon Sanford  
 McNulty Saxton  
 Metcalf Mica  
 Mollohan Scarborough  
 Montgomery Schaefer  
 Moorhead Seastrand  
 Murtha Sensenbrenner  
 Myers Shadegg  
 Myrick Shuster  
 Skeen

NOES—191

Abercrombie Foley McHale  
 Ackerman Ford McHugh  
 Andrews Fowler McInnis  
 Baesler Frank (MA) Meehan  
 Baldacci Franks (CT) Meek  
 Barrett (WI) Franks (NJ) Menendez  
 Bass Frelinghuysen Meyers  
 Becerra Frost Mfume  
 Beilenson Furse Miller (CA)  
 Bentsen Gejdenson Miller (FL)  
 Berman Gephardt Mineta  
 Bilbray Geren Minge  
 Boehlert Gibbons Mink  
 Bonilla Gilchrest Molinari  
 Bonior Gilman Moran  
 Bono Gonzalez Nadler  
 Boucher Gordon Obey  
 Brewster Green Olver  
 Brown (CA) Greenwood Owens  
 Brown (FL) Gunderson Pallone  
 Brown (OH) Gutierrez Pastor  
 Bryant (TX) Harman Payne (NJ)  
 Cardin Hastings (FL) Payne (VA)  
 Castle Hefner Pelosi  
 Chapman Hilliard Peterson (FL)  
 Clay Hinchey Pickett  
 Clayton Horn Pomeroy  
 Clement Houghton Porter  
 Clyburn Hoyer Pryce  
 Coleman Jackson-Lee Ramstad  
 Collins (IL) Jacobs Rangel  
 Collins (MI) Jefferson Reed  
 Condit Johnson (CT) Richardson  
 Coyers Johnson (SD) Rivers  
 Coyne Johnson, E. B. Rose  
 Cramer Johnston Roukema  
 DeFazio Kelly Roybal-Allard  
 DeLauro Kennedy (MA) Rush  
 Dellums Kennedy (RI) Sabo  
 Deutsch Kennelly Sanders  
 Dicks Klug Sawyer  
 Dixon Kolbe Schiff  
 Doggett Lantos Schroeder  
 Dooley Leach Schumer  
 Dunn Levin Scott  
 Durbin Lewis (GA) Serrano  
 Edwards Lincoln Shaw  
 English Lofgren Shays  
 Engel Longley Skaggs  
 Eshoo Lowey Slaughter  
 Evans Luter Stark  
 Farr Markey Stokes  
 Fawell Martinez Studts  
 Fazio Martini Tanner  
 Fields (LA) Matsui Thomas  
 Filner McCarthy Thompson  
 Foglietta McDermott Thornton

Thurman Visclosky Woolsey  
 Torkildsen Ward Wyden  
 Torres Watt (NC) Wynn  
 Torricelli Waxman Yates  
 Towns White Zeliff  
 Velazquez Williams Zimmer  
 Vento Wise

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop Maloney Siskis  
 Blute McKinney Tucker  
 Cox Moakley Waldholtz  
 Dingell Morella Waters  
 Fattah Petri Wilson  
 Flake Reynolds

□ 1452

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. At the conclusion of the debate on the last amendment, 2 hours and 38 minutes are remaining for debate on further amendments to this bill.

Title III is open to amendment at any point.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 72 offered by Mr. SCHUMER:

Page 16, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to withdraw this amendment, but let me explain to my colleagues as to why. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] and I first intended to offer this amendment when the bill was originally scheduled for floor consideration a month ago. During the same week the House voted overwhelmingly to lift the arms embargo in the former Yugoslavia. The amendment was a simple one. It would supply \$50 million worth of TOW antitank missiles to the Bosnian Government which it desperately needs to overcome the lop-sided advantage of the Bosnian Serbs in tanks and armored vehicles and it was intended simply to demonstrate that Congress was willing to put its money where its mouth was, not only by lifting the embargo but by actually providing the Moslems with some of the weapons they need to defend themselves, weapons they cannot afford to buy after years of devastating aggression against them.

I still believe in that amendment, I still believe the Moslems have the right to defend themselves, and at the proper time the United States as the leader of the free world has the duty to assist them. But, of course, significant events have occurred over the last month and they are transpiring as we speak today. The Bosnian Serbs suffered a dramatic reversal in Crimea, the United Nations and the allies have shown renewed resolve and have taken firm action to halt Serb aggression, and for the first time in a while, perhaps since the beginning of hostilities, it looks like we might be on the verge

of meaningful negotiations among the warring parties. As a result, there now exists a bipartisan consensus to delay a vote to override the President's veto of the embargo legislation. Therefore, in light of these circumstances, I intend to withdraw the amendment pending the status and progress of negotiations and events on the ground. Therefore, my colleagues, I say, let us see how events transpire. If need be, we can come back and do this amendment, but I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

#### TITLE IV

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; \$4,742,150,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997.

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; \$8,715,481,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph may be obligated or expended to develop or purchase equipment for an Aegis destroyer variant (commonly known as "Flight IIA") whose initial operating capability is budgeted to be achieved prior to the initial operating capability of the Ship Self-Defense program, nor to develop sensor, processor, or display capabilities which duplicate in any way those being developed in the Ship Self-Defense program: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph for development of the LPD-17 ship may not be obligated unless the baseline design of the ship includes cooperative engagement capability and sufficient own-ship self-defense capability against advanced sea-skimming antiship cruise missiles in the baseline design to achieve an estimated probability of survival from attack by such missiles at a level no less than any other Navy ship: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V-22 may be used to meet unique requirements of the Special Operations Forces: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$189,972,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; \$13,110,335,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That of the funds made available in this paragraph, \$50,000,000 shall be only for develop-

ment of reusable launch vehicle technologies.

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law; \$9,029,666,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That not less than \$170,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be made available only for the Sea-Based Wide Area Defense (Navy Upper-Tier) program.

##### DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, of independent activities of the Director, Test and Evaluation in the direction and supervision of developmental test and evaluation, including performance and joint developmental testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith; \$259,341,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$20,000,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

##### OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith; \$22,587,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

#### TITLE V

#### REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

##### DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

For the Defense Business Operations Fund; \$1,573,800,000: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$695,100,000 shall be available only for the liquidation of prior year accumulated operating losses of the Department of the Navy: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$695,100,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

##### NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App 1744); \$974,220,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (that is; engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: *Provided further*, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of pre-

viously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

#### TITLE VI

#### OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

##### DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law; \$10,205,158,000, of which \$9,917,125,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which \$288,033,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1998, shall be for Procurement: *Provided*, That the Department shall continue to competitively contract during fiscal year 1996 for mail service pharmacy for at least two multi-state regions in addition to the ongoing solicitations for Florida, South Carolina, Georgia, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Hawaii, as well as each base closure area not supported by an at-risk managed care plan; that such services shall be procured independent of any other Department managed care contracts; that one multi-state region shall include the State of Kentucky and that one multi-state region shall include the State of New Mexico: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, \$40,600,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

##### CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, \$746,698,000, of which \$393,850,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, \$299,448,000 shall be for Procurement to remain available until September 30, 1998, and \$53,400,000 shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation to remain available until September 30, 1997.

##### DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for Operation and maintenance; for Procurement; and for Research, development, test and evaluation; \$688,432,000: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph,

\$8,000,000 shall not be obligated or expended until authorized by law.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; \$178,226,000, of which \$177,226,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed \$400,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which \$1,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1998, shall be for Procurement.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VI?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VII.

The text of title VII is as follows:

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System; \$213,900,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, Public Law 103-50, Public Law 103-139, and Public Law 103-335, \$78,100,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the balance of funds in the National Security Education Trust Fund (established pursuant to section 804 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1904)), other than such amount as is necessary for obligations made before the date of the enactment of this Act, is hereby reduced to zero: *Provided further*, That no outlay may be made from the Fund after the date of the enactment of this Act other than to liquidation of all such obligations made before such date, the Fund shall be closed: *Provided further*, That no obligation may be made from the Fund after the date of the enactment of this Act.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account; \$75,683,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VIII.

The text of title VIII is as follows:

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: *Provided*, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of

title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during a single fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of such fiscal year: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed \$2,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided*, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by Congress: *Provided further*, That only for valid Ship Cost Adjustments related to the Shipbuilding and Construction, Navy Appropriation such authority to transfer may be used to transfer funds made available in this or any previous Department of Defense Appropriations Act subject to the same conditions required elsewhere in this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8006. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: *Provided*, That transfers may be made between such funds and the "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense" and "Operation and Maintenance" appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8007. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization

in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: *Provided*, That in the City of Kaiserslautern such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: *Provided further*, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8008. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in session in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8009. None of the funds contained in this Act available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services shall be available for payments to physicians and other non-institutional health care providers in excess of the amounts allowed in fiscal year 1995 for similar services, except that: (a) for services for which the Secretary of Defense determines an increase is justified by economic circumstances, the allowable amounts may be increased in accordance with appropriate economic index data similar to that used pursuant to title XVIII of the Social Security Act; and (b) for services the Secretary determines are overpriced based on allowable payments under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, the allowable amounts shall be reduced by not more than 15 percent (except that the reduction may be waived if the Secretary determines that it would impair adequate access to health care services for beneficiaries). The Secretary shall solicit public comment prior to promulgating regulations to implement this section. Such regulations shall include a limitation, similar to that used under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, on the extent to which a provider may bill a beneficiary an actual charge in excess of the allowable amount.

SEC. 8010. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of \$20,000,000, or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of \$20,000,000 in any one year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least thirty days in advance of the proposed contract award: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed \$500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: *Provided further*, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for multiyear procurement contracts as follows:

- E-2C aircraft;
- AV-8B aircraft remanufacture;
- T-45 aircraft.

SEC. 8011. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported to Congress on September 30 of each year: *Provided*, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99-239.

SEC. 8012. (a) During fiscal year 1996, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 1997 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 1997 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 1997.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8013. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Department of Defense to exceed, outside the fifty United States, its territories, and the District of Columbia, 125,000 civilian workyears: *Provided*, That workyears shall be applied as defined in the Federal Personnel Manual: *Provided further*, That workyears expended in dependent student hiring programs for disadvantaged youths shall not be included in this workyear limitation.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8015. None of the funds appropriated for the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year and hereafter shall be obligated for the pay of any individual who is initially employed after the date of enactment of this Act as a technician in the administration and training of the Army Reserve and the maintenance and repair of supplies issued to the Army Reserve unless such individual is also a military member of the Army Reserve troop program unit that he or she is employed to support. Those technicians employed by the Army Reserve in areas other than Army Reserve troop program units need only be members of the Selected Reserve.

SEC. 8016. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year and hereafter the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force may authorize the retention in an active status until age sixty of any person who would otherwise be removed from an active status and who is employed as a National Guard or Reserve technician in a position in which active status in a reserve component of the Army or Air Force is required as a condition of that employment.

SEC. 8017. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to make contributions to the Department of Defense

Education Benefits Fund pursuant to section 2006(g) of title 10, United States Code, representing the normal cost for future benefits under section 1415(c) of title 38, United States Code, for any member of the armed services who, on or after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) enlists in the armed services for a period of active duty of less than three years; or

(2) receives an enlistment bonus under section 308a or 308f of title 37, United States Code,

nor shall any amounts representing the normal cost of such future benefits be transferred from the Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 2006(d) of title 10, United States Code; nor shall the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pay such benefits to any such member: *Provided*, That, in the case of a member covered by clause (1), these limitations shall not apply to members in combat arms skills or to members who enlist in the armed services on or after July 1, 1989, under a program continued or established by the Secretary of Defense in fiscal year 1991 to test the cost-effective use of special recruiting incentives involving not more than nineteen noncombat arms skills approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided further*, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: *Provided further*, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

SEC. 8018. Funds appropriated for the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year and hereafter shall be available for the payment of not more than 75 percent of the charges of a postsecondary educational institution for the tuition or expenses of an officer in the Ready Reserve of the Army National Guard or Army Reserve for education or training during his off-duty periods, except that no part of the charges may be paid unless the officer agrees to remain a member of the Ready Reserve for at least four years after completion of such training or education.

SEC. 8019. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is performed by more than ten Department of Defense civilian employees until a most efficient and cost-effective organization analysis is completed on such activity or function and certification of the analysis is made to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to a commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that: (1) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 47), popularly referred to as the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act; (2) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or (3) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under 51 percent Native American ownership.

## (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8020. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2301 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8021. For the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508), the term program, project, and activity for appropriations contained in this Act shall be defined as the most specific level of budget items identified in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996, the accompanying House and Senate Committee reports, the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the Committee of Conference, the related classified annexes and reports, and the P-1 and R-1 budget justification documents as subsequently modified by Congressional action: *Provided*, That the following exception to the above definition shall apply:

For the Military Personnel and the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the term "program, project, and activity" is defined as the appropriations accounts contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act: *Provided further*, That at the time the President submits his budget for fiscal year 1997, the Department of Defense shall transmit to the congressional defense committees budget justification document to be known as the "O-1" which shall identify, at the budget activity, activity group, and sub-activity group level, the amounts requested by the President to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance in any budget request, or amended budget request, for fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 8022. Of the funds appropriated to the Army, \$147,900,000 shall be available only for the Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS): *Provided*, That none of these funds can be expended—

(1) except as approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau;

(2) unless RCAS resource management functions are performed by the National Guard Bureau;

(3) to pay the salary of an RCAS program manager who has not been selected and approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and chartered by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Secretary of the Army;

(4) unless the Program Manager (PM) charter makes the PM accountable to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and fully defines his authority, responsibility, reporting channels and organizational structure;

(5) to pay the salaries of individuals assigned to the RCAS program management office unless such organization is comprised of personnel chosen jointly by the Chiefs of the National Guard Bureau and the Army Reserve;

(6) to pay contracted costs for the acquisition of RCAS unless RCAS is an integrated system consisting of software, hardware, and communications equipment and unless such contract continues to preclude the use of Government furnished equipment, operating systems, and executive applications software; and

(7) unless RCAS performs its own classified information processing;

*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated shall be available for procurement of computers for the Army Reserve Component which are used to network or expand the capabilities of existing or future information systems or duplicate functions to be provided under the RCAS contract unless the procurement meets the following criteria: (A) at sites scheduled to receive RCAS equipment prior to September 30, 1995, RCAS ADP equipment may be procured and only in the numbers and types allocated by the RCAS program to each site; and at sites scheduled to receive RCAS equipment after September 30, 1995, RCAS ADP equipment or ADP equipment from a list of RCAS compatible equipment approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau or his designee, may be procured and only in the numbers and types allocated by the RCAS program to each site; (B) the requesting organizational element has insufficient ADP equipment to perform administrative functions but not to exceed the number of work stations determined by the RCAS program for that site; (C) replacement equipment will not exceed the minimum required to maintain the reliability of existing capabilities; (D) replacement will be justified on the basis of cost and feasibility of repairs and maintenance of present ADP equipment as compared to the cost of replacement; and (E) the procurement under this policy must be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau or his designee, provided that the procurement is a one for one replacement action of existing equipment.

SEC. 8023. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section manufactured will include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): *Provided further*, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: *Provided further*, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8024. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Defense may transfer prior year, unobligated balances and funds appropriated in this Act to the operation and maintenance appropriations for the purpose of providing military technician and Department of Defense medical personnel pay and medical programs (including CHAMPUS) the same exemption from sequestration set forth in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) as that

granted the other military personnel accounts: *Provided*, That any transfer made pursuant to any use of the authority provided by this provision shall be limited so that the amounts reprogrammed to the operation and maintenance appropriations do not exceed the amounts sequestered under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508): *Provided further*, That the authority to make transfers pursuant to this section is in addition to the authority to make transfers under other provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense may proceed with such transfer after notifying the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate twenty calendar days in session before any such transfer of funds under this provision.

SEC. 8025. None of the funds appropriated by this Act available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care provider for inpatient mental health service for care received when a patient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or residential treatment care by a medical or health care professional having an economic interest in the facility to which the patient is referred: *Provided*, That this limitation does not apply in the case of inpatient mental health services provided under the program for the handicapped under subsection (d) of section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, provided as partial hospital care, or provided pursuant to a waiver authorized by the Secretary of Defense because of medical or psychological circumstances of the patient that are confirmed by a health professional who is not a Federal employee after a review, pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretary, which takes into account the appropriate level of care for the patient, the intensity of services required by the patient, and the availability of that care.

SEC. 8026. Funds available in this Act may be used to provide transportation for the next-of-kin of individuals who have been prisoners of war or missing in action from the Vietnam era to an annual meeting in the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe.

SEC. 8027. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may, by Executive Agreement, establish with host nation governments in NATO member states a separate account into which such residual value amounts negotiated in the return of United States military installations in NATO member states may be deposited, in the currency of the host nation, in lieu of direct monetary transfers to the United States Treasury: *Provided*, That such credits may be utilized only for the construction of facilities to support United States military forces in that host nation, or such real property maintenance and base operating costs that are currently executed through monetary transfers to such host nations: *Provided further*, That the Department of Defense's budget submission for fiscal year 1997 shall identify such sums anticipated in residual value settlements, and identify such construction, real property maintenance or base operating costs that shall be funded by the host nation through such credits: *Provided further*, That all military construction projects to be executed from such accounts must be previously approved from a prior Act of Congress: *Provided further*, That each such Executive Agreement with a NATO member host nation shall be reported to the congressional defense com-

mittees thirty days prior to the conclusion and endorsement of any such agreement established under this provision.

SEC. 8028. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense in this Act shall be used to demilitarize or dispose of more than 310,784 unserviceable M1 Garand rifles and M1 Carbines.

SEC. 8029. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay more than 50 percent of an amount paid to any person under section 308 of title 37, United States Code, in a lump sum.

SEC. 8030. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to assign a supervisor's title or grade when the number of people he or she supervises is considered as a basis for this determination: *Provided*, That savings that result from this provision are represented as such in future budget proposals.

SEC. 8031. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for payments under the Department of Defense contract with the Louisiana State University Medical Center involving the use of cats for Brain Missile Wound Research, and the Department of Defense shall not make payments under such contract from funds obligated prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, except as necessary for costs incurred by the contractor prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That funds necessary for the care of animals covered by this contract are allowed.

SEC. 8032. None of the funds provided in this Act or any other Act shall be available to conduct bone trauma research at any Army Research Laboratory until the Secretary of the Army certifies that the synthetic compound to be used in the experiments is of such a type that its use will result in a significant medical finding, the research has military application, the research will be conducted in accordance with the standards set by an animal care and use committee, and the research does not duplicate research already conducted by a manufacturer or any other research organization.

SEC. 8033. No more than \$50,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8034. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated or otherwise available for any Federal agency, the Congress, the judicial branch, or the District of Columbia may be used for the pay, allowances, and benefits of an employee as defined by section 2105 of title 5 or an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia, permanent or temporary indefinite, who—

(1) is a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, as described in section 261 of title 10, or the National Guard, as described in section 101 of title 32;

(2) performs, for the purpose of providing military aid to enforce the law or providing assistance to civil authorities in the protection or saving of life or property or prevention of injury—

(A) Federal service under section 331, 332, 333, 3500, or 8500 of title 10, or other provision of law, as applicable, or

(B) full-time military service for his State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory of the United States; and

(3) requests and is granted—

(A) leave under the authority of this section; or

(B) annual leave, which may be granted without regard to the provisions of sections 5519 and 6323(b) of title 5, if such employee is otherwise entitled to such annual leave:

*Provided*, That any employee who requests leave under subsection (3)(A) for service described in subsection (2) of this section is entitled to such leave, subject to the provisions of this section and of the last sentence of section 6323(b) of title 5, and such leave shall be considered leave under section 6323(b) of title 5.

SEC. 8035. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to perform any cost study pursuant to the provisions of OMB Circular A-76 if the study being performed exceeds a period of twenty-four months after initiation of such study with respect to a single function activity or forty-eight months after initiation of such study for a multi-function activity.

SEC. 8036. Funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8037. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may adjust wage rates for civilian employees hired for certain health care occupations as authorized for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by section 7455 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 8038. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC-130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act.

SEC. 8039. (a) Of the funds for the procurement of supplies or services appropriated by this Act, qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped shall be afforded the maximum practicable opportunity to participate as subcontractors and suppliers in the performance of contracts let by the Department of Defense.

(b) During the current fiscal year, a business concern which has negotiated with a military service or defense agency a subcontracting plan for the participation by small business concerns pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) shall be given credit toward meeting that subcontracting goal for any purchases made from qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped.

(c) For the purpose of this section, the phrase "qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped" means a nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped that has been approved by the Committee for the Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46-48).

SEC. 8040. During the current fiscal year, net receipts pursuant to collections from third party payers pursuant to section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, shall be made available to the local facility of the uniformed services responsible for the collections and shall be over and above the facility's direct budget amount.

SEC. 8041. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed \$350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: *Provided*, That, upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriation or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8042. (a) Funds appropriated in this Act to finance activities of Department of Defense (DoD) Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) may not be obligated or expended for a FFRDC if a member of its Board of Directors or Trustees simultaneously serves on the Board of Directors or Trustees of a profit-making company under contract to the Department of Defense unless the FFRDC has a DoD approved conflict of interest policy for its members.

(b) LIMITATION ON COMPENSATION.—No employee or executive officer of a defense FFRDC may be compensated at a rate exceeding Executive Schedule Level I by that FFRDC.

(c) LIMITATION ON COMPENSATION.—No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity except under the same conditions, and to the same extent, as members of the Defense Science Board: *Provided*, That a member of any such entity shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts available to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1996, not more than \$1,252,650,000 may be obligated for financing activities of defense FFRDCs: *Provided*, That in addition to any other reductions required by this section, the total amounts appropriated in titles II, III, and IV of this Act to finance activities carried out by defense FFRDCs and other entities providing consulting services, studies and analyses, systems engineering and technical assistance, and technical engineering and management support are hereby reduced by \$90,097,000.

SEC. 8043. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: *Provided*, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: *Provided further*, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8044. None of the unobligated balances available in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund during the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to finance any grant or contract to conduct research, development, test and evaluation activities for the development or production of advanced materials, unless amounts for such purposes are specifically appropriated in a subsequent appropriations Act.

SEC. 8045. For the purposes of this Act, the term "congressional defense committees" means the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations and the

Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

SEC. 8046. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: *Provided*, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or defense agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: *Provided further*, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8047. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 1996. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Buy American Act" means title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

SEC. 8048. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may, when he considers it in the best interest of the United States, cancel any part of an indebtedness, up to \$2,500, that is or was owed to the United States by a member or former member of a uniformed service if such indebtedness, as determined by the Secretary, was incurred in connection with Operation Desert Shield/Storm: *Provided*, That the amount of an indebtedness previously paid by a member or former member and cancelled under this section shall be refunded to the member.

SEC. 8049. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain available at the end of the current fiscal year as a result of energy cost savings realized by the Department of Defense shall remain available for obligation for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2865 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8050. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, voluntary separation incentives payable under 10 U.S.C. 1175 may be paid in such amounts as are necessary from the assets of the Voluntary Separation Incentive Fund established by section 1175(h)(1).

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8051. Amounts deposited during the current fiscal year to the special account established under 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) and to the special account established under 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1) are appropriated and shall be available until transferred by the Secretary of Defense to current applicable appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense under the terms and conditions specified by 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) (A) and (B) and 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1)(B), to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 8052. During the current fiscal year, appropriations available to the Department of Defense may be used to reimburse a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces who is not otherwise entitled to travel and transportation allowances and who occupies transient government housing while performing active duty for training or inactive duty training: *Provided*, That such members may be provided lodging in kind if transient government quarters are unavailable as if the member was entitled to such allowances under subsection (a) of section 404 of title 37, United States Code: *Provided further*, That if lodging in kind is provided, any authorized service charge or cost of such lodging may be paid directly from funds appropriated for operation and maintenance of the reserve component of the member concerned.

SEC. 8053. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to support in any manner, including travel or other related expenses, the "Tailhook Association".

SEC. 8054. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for appropriation for that fiscal year for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the Defense Agencies.

SEC. 8055. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8056. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, annual payments granted under the provisions of section 4416 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-428; 106 Stat. 2714) shall be made from appropriations which are available for the pay of reserve component personnel.

SEC. 8057. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, not more than \$119,200,000 shall be available for payment of the operating costs of NATO Headquarters.

SEC. 8058. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than \$50,000.

SEC. 8059. During the current fiscal year and thereafter, appropriations available for the pay and allowances of active duty members of the Armed Forces shall be available to pay the retired pay which is payable pursuant to section 4403 of Public Law 102-484 (10 U.S.C. 1293 note) under the terms and conditions provided in section 4403.

SEC. 8060. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Defense Business Operations

Fund shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Defense Business Operations Fund if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 1997 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 1997 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 1997 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Defense Business Operations Fund.

SEC. 8061. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for use by a Military Department to modify an aircraft, weapon, ship or other item of equipment, that the Military Department concerned plans to retire or otherwise dispose of within five years after completion of the modification: *Provided*, That this prohibition shall not apply to safety modifications: *Provided further*, That this prohibition may be waived by the Secretary of a Military Department if the Secretary determines it is in the best national security interest of the United States to provide such waiver and so notifies the congressional defense committees in writing.

SEC. 8062. No part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress.

SEC. 8063. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for payment of the compensation of personnel assigned to or serving in the National Foreign Intelligence Program in excess of 92 percent of such personnel actually assigned to or serving in the National Foreign Intelligence Program on September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That in making any reduction in the number of such personnel that may be required pursuant to this section, the percentage of reductions to Senior Intelligence Service positions shall be equal to or exceed the percentage of reductions to non-Senior Intelligence Service positions: *Provided further*, That in making any reduction in the number of such personnel that may be required pursuant to this section, the percentage of reductions to positions in the National Capital Region shall be equal to or exceed the percentage of reductions to positions outside of the National Capital Region.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds provided by this Act may be used to pay the salaries of any person or persons who authorize the transfer of obligated and deobligated appropriations into the Reserve for Contingencies of the Central Intelligence Agency.

SEC. 8065. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 1997.

SEC. 8066. The classified Annex prepared by the Committee on Appropriations to accom-

pany the report on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996 is hereby incorporated into this Act: *Provided*, That the amounts specified in the classified Annex are not in addition to amounts appropriated by other provisions of this Act: *Provided further*, That the President shall provide for appropriate distribution of the classified Annex, or of appropriate portions of the classified Annex, within the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 8067. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8068. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act for the High Performance Computing Modernization Program shall be made available only for the acquisition and sustainment of operations, including maintenance of the supercomputing and related networking capability at (1) the DOD Science and Technology sites under the cognizance of the DDR&E, (2) the DOD Test and Evaluation centers under the Director, Test and Evaluation, OUSD (A&T), and (3) the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization: *Provided*, That the contracts, contract modifications, or contract options are awarded competitively solely upon the requirements of the users.

SEC. 8069. Amounts collected for the use of the facilities of the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics during the current fiscal year pursuant to section 1459(g) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 and deposited to the special account established under subsection 1459(g)(2) of that Act are appropriated and shall be available until expended for the operation and maintenance of the Center as provided for in subsection 1459(g)(2).

SEC. 8070. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to fill the commander's position at any military medical facility with a health care professional unless the prospective candidate can demonstrate professional administrative skills.

SEC. 8071. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term "Buy American Act" means title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8072. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analyses, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work, or

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source, or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support:

*Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than \$25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8073. Funds appropriated by this Act for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 1996 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

SEC. 8074. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated for design, development, acquisition, or operation of more than 47 Titan IV expendable launch vehicles, or for satellite mission-model planning for a Titan IV requirement beyond 47 vehicles.

(b) \$115,226,000 made available in this Act for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, may only be obligated for development of a new family of medium-lift and heavy-lift expendable launch vehicles evolved from existing technologies.

SEC. 8075. No funds available to the Department of Defense in this Act may be used to establish additional field operating agencies of any element of the Department during fiscal year 1996, except for field operating agencies funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program.

SEC. 8076. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for resident classes entering the war colleges after September 30, 1996, the Department of Defense shall require that not less than 20 percent of the total of United States military students at each war college shall be from military departments other than the hosting military department: *Provided*, That each military department will recognize the attendance at a sister military department war college as the equivalent of attendance at its own war college for promotion and advancement of personnel.

SEC. 8077. None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated for payment on new contracts on which allowable costs charged to the government include payments for individual compensation at a rate in excess of \$250,000 per year.

SEC. 8078. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military (civilian) technicians of the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military (civilian) technicians, unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8079. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated in this Act are available to compensate members of the National Guard for duty performed pursuant to a plan submitted by a Governor of a State and approved by the Secretary of Defense under section 112 of title 32, United States Code: *Provided*, That during the performance of such duty, the members of the National

Guard shall be under State command and control: *Provided further*, That such duty shall be treated as full-time National Guard duty for purposes of sections 12602 (a)(2) and (b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8080. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Unified and Specified Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence support to Unified Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the General Defense Intelligence Program and the Consolidated Cryptologic Program: *Provided*, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8081. (a) No project for the construction of any facility, or improvement to any facility, having an estimated Federal cost in excess of \$750,000, may be undertaken in any fiscal year unless specifically identified as a separate item in the President's annual fiscal year budget request or otherwise specifically authorized and appropriated if such facility or improvement would be used primarily by personnel of the intelligence community.

(b) As used in this section, the term "intelligence community" has the same meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

SEC. 8082. The Secretary of Defense, from within funds provided in this Act, may obligate not to exceed \$75,000 to fulfill Department of Defense obligations under the Educational Loan Repayment Programs for State-sponsored student loan programs not covered under title IV, part B or E of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (title 20 U.S.C. 1071-1087).

SEC. 8083. All refunds or other amounts collected in the administration of the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) shall be credited to current year appropriations.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8084. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be transferred to or obligated from the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the total cost for the planning design, construction and installation of equipment for the renovation of the Pentagon Reservation will not exceed \$1,218,000,000.

SEC. 8085. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8086. Appropriations available in this Act under the heading "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide" for increasing energy and water efficiency in Federal buildings may, during their period of availability, be transferred to other appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense for projects related to increasing energy and water efficiency, to be merged with and to be available for the same general purposes, and

for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred.

SEC. 8087. Funds in the amount of \$61,300,000 received during fiscal year 1996 by the Department of the Air Force pursuant to the "Memorandum of Agreement between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the United States Air Force on Titan IV/Centaur Launch Support for the Cassini Mission," signed September 8, 1994, and September 23, 1994, and Attachments A, B and C to the Memorandum, shall be merged with appropriations available for research, development, test and evaluation and procurement for fiscal year 1996, and shall be available for the same time period as the appropriation with which merged, and shall be available for obligation only for those Titan IV vehicles and Titan IV-related activities under contract as of the date of enactment of this Act, as well as on the follow-on launch services and program sustaining support contract to be awarded in fiscal year 1996.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8088. In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, \$44,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense and shall be available only for transfer to the United States Coast Guard for activities relating to national security.

SEC. 8089. The total amount appropriated in title II, III, and IV of this Act is hereby reduced by \$30,000,000 for savings through improved management of contractor automatic data processing costs charged through indirect rates on Department of Defense acquisition contracts.

SEC. 8090. (a) None of the funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be obligated by the Department of Defense for acquisition or advance procurement of any system or end item using incremental funding.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "incremental funding" has the meaning provided in paragraph (3) of section 114(f) of title 10, United States Code, as added by section 1007 of H.R. 1530 of the One Hundred Fourth Congress (the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996), as passed by the House of Representatives on June 15, 1995.

(c) This section does not apply to an obligation that is classified as an advance procurement for a system or end item that is to be procured on a full funding basis.

SEC. 8091. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8092. None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Department of the Army may be obligated for procurement of 120mm mortars or 120mm mortar ammunition manufactured outside of the United States.

SEC. 8093. The Department of Defense shall release all funds appropriated and available for the HAVE GAZE program to the Department of the Air Force for obligation under existing contractual arrangements.

SEC. 8094. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (a) funds available to the Navy in the Operation and Maintenance appropriation for refueling overhauls and defueling inactivations of nuclear-powered warships are available to transport the shipments of naval spent nuclear fuel to the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory needed for examination and storage to avoid threats to the national security; and (b) the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to immediately

commence and accomplish such transportation: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall make the determination as to what shipments are required for that purpose and shall ensure that the shipments are made in accordance with the practices and requirements applied to previous container shipments of naval spent fuel to the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory: *Provided further*, That the authority in this section shall expire on September 30, 1996 or upon the vacation or stay of the current or any subsequent injunction issued by the United States District Court for the District of Idaho which enjoins such shipments, whichever occurs first: *Provided further*, That the authority in this section may not be used unless the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that a good-faith agreement between the State of Idaho and the United States Government was attempted but could not be reached concerning interim shipments of spent nuclear fuel enjoined by any such injunction based on national security reasons.

SEC. 8095. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to lease or charter a vessel on a long-term basis used to transport fuel or oil for the Department of Defense in those instances where the leases involve the construction of new ships unless the Secretary of Defense requires that the vessel be constructed in the United States with a double hull under the long term lease or charter authority provided in section 2401 note of title 10, United States Code: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in force on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That by 1997 at least 20 percent of annual leases and charters must be for ships of new construction: *Provided further*, That the Military Sealift Command shall plan to achieve the goal of eliminating single hull ship leases by the year 2015.

SEC. 8096. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy shall be used to develop or procure main propulsion engines for the LPD-17 class of ships unless such equipment is powered by a diesel engine manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes or there exists a significant cost or quality difference.

SEC. 8097. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy shall be used to develop or procure an emergency generator set for the New Attack Submarine unless such equipment is powered by a diesel engine manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes or there exists a significant cost or quality difference.

SEC. 8098. The Army shall use George Air Force Base as the interim airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches Initial Operational Capability as the permanent airhead: *Pro-*

*vided*, That within funds appropriated for "Operation and Maintenance, Army" in this Act, not less than \$2,000,000 shall be available only to operate the National Training Center's rotational airhead at the now closed George Air Force Base: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army shall provide the congressional defense committees with a report assessing the Army's compliance with the terms of this provision not later than March 31, 1996: *Provided further*, That not later than April 30, 1996, the Department of the Army shall complete planning and design of the Barstow-Daggett airfield as the permanent airhead in support of training rotations at the National Training Center.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8099. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may carry out transfers of funds of not to exceed \$200,000,000, as provided in section 127a(c) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (H.R. 1530): *Provided*, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8100. The sum of \$77,500,000 appropriated in title I and the sum of \$564,300,000 appropriated in title II for additional incremental costs associated with the operations of the Department of Defense designated, as of June 1, 1995, as Operation Southern Watch and Operation Provide Comfort—

(1) shall not be obligated or expended before the date on which the budget of the President for fiscal year 1997 is transmitted to Congress; and

(2) may be obligated or expended for such incremental costs on or after such date only if that budget specifically sets forth amounts proposed for fiscal year 1997 for each of those operations.

SEC. 8101. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit, on a quarterly basis, a report to the congressional defense committees setting forth all costs (including incremental costs) incurred by the Department of Defense during the preceding quarter in implementing or supporting resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, including any such resolution calling for international sanctions, international peacekeeping operations, and humanitarian missions undertaken by the Department of Defense. The quarterly report shall include an aggregate of all such Department of Defense costs by operation or mission.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall detail in the quarterly reports all efforts made to seek credit against past United Nations expenditures and all efforts made to seek compensation from the United Nations for costs incurred by the Department of Defense in implementing and supporting United Nations activities.

SEC. 8102. (a) LIMITATION ON PARTICIPATION IN CERTAIN OPERATIONS.—None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year shall be obligated or expended for costs incurred by United States Armed Forces units serving in an operation described in subsection (b) unless the President engages in consultations with the bipartisan leadership of Congress and the congressional committees named in subsection (e) regarding such operation in accordance with subsection (c)(1).

(b) COVERED OPERATIONS.—(1) This section applies to the following:

(A) Any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation that is not underway as of the date of the enactment of this Act and that is authorized by the Security Council of the United Nations under chapter VI or VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

(B) Any other international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation that is not underway as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(C) Any deployment after the date of the enactment of this Act of United States ground forces in the territory of the former Yugoslavia above the level of such forces so deployed as of such date of enactment, other than a deployment involving fewer than 100 personnel.

(D) Except as provided in paragraph (2), any international humanitarian assistance operation.

(2) This section does not apply with respect to—

(A) an international humanitarian assistance operation carried out in response to a disaster; or

(B) any other international humanitarian assistance operation if the President reports to Congress that the estimated cost of such operation is less than \$50,000,000.

(c) CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS.—(1) Consultations under subsection (a) in the case of any operation shall be initiated before the initial deployment of United States Armed Forces units to participate in the operation and, whenever possible, at least 15 days before such deployment. However, if the President determines that the national security so requires, the President may delay the initiation of such consultations until after such initial deployment, but in no case may such consultations be initiated later than 48 hours after such deployment.

(2) Such consultations shall include discussion of all of the following:

(A) The goals of the operation and the mission of any United States Armed Forces units involved in the operation.

(B) The United States interests that will be served by the operation.

(C) The estimated cost of the operation.

(D) The strategy by which the President proposes to fund the operation, including possible supplemental appropriations or payments from international organizations, foreign countries, or other donors.

(E) The extent of involvement of armed forces and other contributions of personnel from other nations.

(F) The anticipated duration and scope of the operation.

(3) Such consultations shall continue on a periodic basis throughout the period of the deployment.

(d) REQUESTS FOR EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS.—Whenever there is a deployment of United States Armed Forces to perform an international humanitarian, peacekeeping, or peace-enforcement operation, the President should seek emergency supplemental appropriations to meet the incremental costs to the Department of Defense of that deployment not later than 90 days after the date on which such deployment commences.

(e) COMMITTEES TO BE INCLUDED IN CONSULTATIONS.—The committees referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The congressional defense committees.

(2) The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(3) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8103. (a) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of

the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an international organization any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use in the activities described in subsection (b) unless the congressional defense committees are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(b) COVERED ACTIVITIES.—(1) This section applies to—

(A) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and

(B) any other international peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, humanitarian, or disaster relief operation.

(c) REQUIRED NOTICE.—A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including the reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8104. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense shall be obligated or expended for the purposes of deploying United States Armed Forces to participate in the implementation of a negotiated peace settlement in Bosnia-Herzegovina, unless such deployment is previously authorized by law.

SEC. 8105. Except as expressly authorized by law or provided for specifically in an Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense after December 1, 1995, for the current fiscal year or any fiscal year hereafter shall be available to support or otherwise provide funds for any program or activity (other than an intelligence program or activity) for which another Federal department or agency has primary responsibility or which is a type of program or activity for which funds are customarily provided in appropriations available to another Federal department or agency. The limitation in the preceding sentence does not apply with respect to funds made available to another department or agency in accordance with section 1535 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 8106. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense shall be obligated or expended to make a financial contribution to the United Nations for the cost of an United Nations peacekeeping activity (whether pursuant to assessment or a voluntary contribution) or for payment of any United States arrearage to the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VIII?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "Procurement of Ammunition, Army" may be obligated or

expanded for the procurement of munitions unless such acquisition fully complies with the Competition in Contracting Act.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have cleared this amendment with both the majority and minority leaders on the committee. My amendment saves taxpayers' dollars, supports open and fair competition and codifies existing law. It is noncontroversial.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have examined this amendment and discussed it with the gentleman and believe that it does promote competition and think it is a positive addition to this bill and we accept the amendment.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VIII?

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 47 Offered by Ms. WOOLSEY. Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to modify any Trident I submarine to enable that submarine to be deployed with Trident II (D-5) missiles.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, once again I am here to get this body to do something that the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, the Council for a Livable World, and Members on both sides of the aisle believe should have been long ago: Stop wasting money on the Trident nuclear missiles.

At a time when this Congress is making cuts in education, student aid, and Medicare, I am outraged that we are even talking about investing \$3 billion over the next 7 years in this cold war relic, especially when the Navy didn't even request it.

Backfitting 4 Trident submarines that now carry C-4 missiles with expensive D-5 missiles would give us a total of 14 subs carrying D-5 missiles; 4 more than the Navy originally planned.

My amendment does not do away with D-5 missiles; it simply cancels the backfit, limits the Navy to 10 subs with D-5 missiles, and saves taxpayers \$3 billion over 7 years. That is a reasonable request.

It is a reasonable request because the D-5 missile was designed to hit targets in the Soviet Union. Well, guess what folks. The Soviet Union no longer exists. If 10 D-5 subs were enough to stop the Soviet threat during the height of the cold war, then 10 D-5 subs are certainly enough to stop today's smaller threat from the former Soviet Union.

And if my colleagues are concerned about threats from rogue nations like North Korea and Iran, my answer is simple: One Trident submarine, loaded with 24 D-5 missiles, would be more than enough to stop a threat from these nations.

And let us not get into a debate about this amendment damaging military readiness. If military readiness is a problem, it is not because we have not pumped enough money into the military budget. Rather, it is because the Pentagon has some seriously misplaced spending priorities.

With soldiers on food stamps, we cannot afford to be wasting billions of precious dollars on this wasteful and expendable program. But really when it comes down to it, the Woolsey amendment is not about spending priorities within the military; it is about spending priorities, period.

We cannot balance the budget on the backs of children, on the backs of working families, and on the backs of seniors, while allowing the Pentagon's budget to balloon.

Let us hold this Congress and the Pentagon accountable. Let us make it clear that spending an additional \$3 billion on the Trident force is a wasteful and ill-advised mistake. It is time to put any further spending on this cold war relic where it belongs: in the history books.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly point out that the President of the United States, through the Nuclear Posture Review, endorsed the need for the Trident D-2 backfit. The D-5 missile has improved military effectiveness and reliability, greater range, and twice the design life of the older C-4 missile which it replaces.

Trident submarines are expected to last at least 30 years, and in today's world they might have to last twice that long. The C-4 missile will definitely not have that much of a shelf life. C-4 production actually terminated in 1987 and the C-4 will have to be replaced.

The most cost-effective approach is to continue procurement of the D-5 missile and use some of them to backfit the older Trident submarines.

However, the strongest argument I can make against this amendment is that there is no money in this bill for

the D-5 submarine backfit and hopefully the gentlewoman would withdraw the amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Woolsey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] makes an awful lot of sense. The question is how much is enough and are we buying things based on a threat-based analysis? I think everybody knows we have enough D-5 missiles to more than deter any threat from anywhere at any time. We have got a lock on all of this.

The real question is why do we keep buying more and more and more? Or why are planning for more, when really, if we were going to invest wisely, I think we would fall back and figure out what might be coming in the future, if some enemy in the future moves forward. But we have a lock on this technology. We know how to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I just think the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] makes a tremendous amount of sense with this and I congratulate the gentlewoman.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the issue of there being no money in the bill for the backfit. The Navy is currently planning how to accomplish the backfit and funds in this bill will be used for this planning.

My amendment says that this planning will not occur and will forgo the backfit. It makes an important policy statement and it sets precedent for future appropriations bills that will contain funds expressly for the backfit. Even though there is no money right now for backfit, there is certainly money in the bill for planning that backfit.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Woolsey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year the House voted on this issue and basically took the position that we should support the backfit.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my distinguished friend and colleague that the Nuclear Posture Review, which was done by the Department of Defense, does, in fact, call for the backfit of 4 *Trident* submarines with the D-5 missile. That is the administration's position and that is the Navy's position.

So, I would just say this: That we have entered into a series of arms control agreements which call upon us to make major reduction in our land-based missiles, to reduce our bomber force to a level that I am frankly troubled by, and the basic deterrent that we have left is on our *Trident* submarines, some of which are based on the east coast in Georgia and others on the west coast in Washington State, from my home area.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to stay with their position of

last year, to oppose the Woolsey amendment, and to continue to support the *Trident* submarine program and the D-5 backfit.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VIII?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida: On page 55, line 8, after the word "committees" insert the following: ", and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate".

On page 87, line 10, after the word "committees" insert the following: ", the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate".

On page 91, line 21, after the word "committees" insert the following: ", and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate".

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment. We have, in this bill, asked the Department of Defense to provide certain reports to the defense committees of the House and the Senate. This amendment would include as recipients of those reports the Committee on International Relations in the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, it is strictly a technical amendment.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, we applaud the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and have no problems with the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURTHA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURTHA: On page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

Sec. 8107. None of the funds in this Act may be used to implement any change to the computation of military retired pay as required by law in fiscal year 1995 for military personnel who entered the Service before September 8, 1980.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment takes care of a problem which for 2 years the Committee on Appropriations has worked out. There was a perception it saved a lot of money by changing the formula for retirement of the military. We find that it has not saved a lot of money. We are offering an amendment to rectify that problem.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we certainly concur with this amendment and urge that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VIII?

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. 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. SANDERS: Page 94, after line 3, add the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the Pentagon is spending \$31 million in taxpayer dollars for corporate bonuses for the top executives of just one major defense contractor, the Lockheed-Martin Corp. With so much concern about the Federal deficit and Government waste, I would hope that every Member of the Congress supports the amendment that I am offering which would prohibit this practice.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, earlier this year Pentagon officials agreed to use \$31 million in taxpayer money to pay a third of the \$92 million in bonuses that top corporate executives of the Martin-Marrietta Corp. and the Lockheed Corp. granted themselves for staging the largest merger of defense contractors in American history, and that was the creation of the Lockheed-Martin Corp. with \$11.6 billion in annual military sales and \$23 billion in total annual sales.

Just 2 months after this development took place, the same corporate executives announced plans to fire 19,000 American workers and to close 12 factories and laboratories across the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be an example of corporate welfare at its worst and I would hope that the Members would support my amendment, which would prohibit this golden parachute, as well as any which take place.

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

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from

Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for the work he has done on this amendment and certainly, speaking for this side of the aisle, we would be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and we are happy to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont. [Mr. SANDERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 85 offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 8107. (a) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY CONTRACTORS FOR POLITICAL ADVOCACY.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by any Federal contractor for an activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence Federal, State, or local legislation or agency action, including any of the following:

(A) Monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similar activity.

(B) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through an attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any segment thereof, including any communication between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(C) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through communication with any member or employee of a legislative body or agency, or with any government official or employee who may participate in the formulation of the legislation or agency action, including any communication between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to engage in such an attempt or to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(2) Participating or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office, including monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similar activity.

(3) Participating in any judicial litigation or agency proceeding (including as an amicus curiae) in which agents or instrumentalities of Federal, State, or local governments are parties, other than litigation in which the contractor or potential contractor is a defendant appearing in its own behalf; is defending its tax-exempt status; or is challenging a government decision or action directed specifically at the powers, rights, or duties of that contractor or potential contractor.

(4) Allocating, disbursing, or contributing any funds or in-kind support to any individ-

ual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for political advocacy for the previous Federal fiscal year exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO AWARD CONTRACTS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to award a contract when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the expenditures of the potential contractor (other than an individual person) for activities described in subsection (a) for any one of the previous five Federal fiscal years (excluding any fiscal year before 1996) exceeded the sum of—

(A) the first \$20,000,000 of the difference between the potential contractor's total expenditures made in the fiscal year and the total amount of Federal contracts and grants it was awarded in that fiscal year, multiplied by .05; and

(B) the remainder of the difference calculated in subparagraph (A), multiplied by .01;

(2) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract to purchase or secure any goods or services (including dues and membership fees) from any other individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for activities described in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1995 exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year; or

(3) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract for a purpose (other than to purchase or secure goods or services) that was not specifically permitted by Congress in the law authorizing the contract.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The activities described in subsection (a) do not include an activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Making available the results of non-partisan analysis, study, research, or debate.

(2) Providing technical advice or assistance (where such advice would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action) to a government body or to a committee or other subdivision thereof in response to a written request by such body or subdivision, as the case may be.

(3) Communications between a contractor and its employees with respect to legislation, proposed legislation, agency action, or proposed agency action of direct interest to the contractor and such employees, other than communications described in subparagraph (C).

(4) Any communication with a governmental official or employee, other than—

(A) a communication with a member or employee of a legislative body or agency (where such communication would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action); or

(B) a communication the principal purpose of which is to influence legislation or agency action.

(5) Official communication by employees of State or local governments, or by organizations whose membership consists exclusively of State or local governments.

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues can just accept this amendment. I think it is fairly simple. Most of the Members of the body voted on an amendment very similar to this recently and that was

when we were debating the Labor HHS appropriations. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] offered an amendment that said that any recipient of a Federal grant was not allowed to lobby with their non-Federal funds. Non-Federal funds.

So as my colleagues may know from many of the articles that have appeared since in the Wall Street Journal and other places, they talk about how the Girl Scouts, the Red Cross, all sorts of groups such as that, will not be able to lobby here because they got Federal funds, even with non-Federal funds.

OK. That makes sense.

Now, I voted against that, because I felt that that was really infringing their free speech.

What my amendment does today is say, "Okay, guys, I lost. If we are going to do that to nonprofits, then we certainly ought to be doing it to profits."

My amendment says what is good for the goose is good for the gander, or what is good for a nonprofit ought to be able to be good for a profit.

What this amendment says is that companies that receive high amounts of money for defense contracts and Government contracts that are in for-profit businesses also cannot use their non-Government money to lobby.

Now, let us be real serious about this here. Who do you think, who do you think has the most influence here: the Girl Scouts or some of the big contractors? Now, we have shut the Girl Scouts out, and we have shut the YMCA out, and we have shut the Boy Scouts out, and we have shut out all of those groups because we realize the terrific power they were wielding in this body, and I think if you really believe that, then you had better look at what is going on with defense firms.

I got from several different groups who monitor this the amount of money defense firms are handing out. It is a phenomenal amount of money. I woke up this morning, there were TV ads on television for the B-2 bomber. That looks like lobbying to me. Imagine, it would be in Washington where policymakers are getting up and watching the news. We see ads in newspapers, we see people coming around to offices, we see pens, we see all sorts of things. These are the real megalobbyists. They not only have that, they have something the nonprofits do not have, they also have political action committees.

So yesterday we were having a big debate on this floor about how we ought to have real reform, and if we are going to have real reform and we are going to insist that nonprofits are going to be gagged and not be able to talk or be able to spend their money to consult Congress, we certainly ought to adopt this amendment which just says do to the profits what you do to the nonprofits; do to the defense contractors and other people who have Government contracts what you did to the nonprofit people who got grants from the Government.

That, I think, is something that if we do not do it, it is going to be awfully hard to explain back home, and I think when we see more and more groups getting concerned about whether we are making decisions here based on the threat or whether we are making decisions here based on PAC contributions or lobbying or nonprofit groups exerting excess powers such as Senator SIMPSON in the Senate has talked about, or whatever, we have got to do this equally and evenhandedly, or otherwise it looks like we are being disingenuous.

So while I would like to have everybody have free speech, since this body overruled my position and decided we are not going to have free speech for nonprofits, that these very, very dangerous groups out there that have gotten these grants must not be able to lobby even with their own money, I certainly think if we are that afraid of the Sierra Club and if we are that afraid of the Children's Defense Fund, we ought to be afraid of big contractors who live off of this Federal money, and some make as much as almost \$23 billion a year. We certainly ought to say they should not be able to use their non-Government funds to lobby.

So I would hope this could be agreed to, and I would hope that we could get on to it since the body has agreed to exactly the same thing in other appropriation bills for nonprofits, and so I hope everybody can concede this very early.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do so only because I am not exactly sure what the effect would be. We were just provided this amendment today. We are trying to determine what effect it would have on title 10 of the United States Code, Armed Forces, which deals with procurement and contracting and things of this type. I am not really sure what effect that would have, and I am just wondering if the gentlewoman would be willing to defer a decision on this amendment for maybe 15 or 20 minutes to give us a chance to try to finish our research on it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I appreciate your open-mindedness on this. And, yes, we have researched that.

But if we could ask unanimous consent to withhold further debate on this for 15 minutes, would that be adequate?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That would be helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman can withdraw the amendment by unanimous consent and then reoffer it once the research is done. Otherwise the debate would have to continue until such time as everybody was talked out and the Chair would then put the question on the amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my concern about that is because of the very stringent time limits we are under, I might not be able to get back up and get it offered. If there is some assurance that I can get recognized again before the time clock goes off.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would have no problem with some assurance there. I would like to point out, these laws dealing with this subject really are legislation and not appropriations. The gentlewoman is on the authorizing committee. That might have been the place to have addressed this issue.

But we began this bill in late July, early August. Here it is now September. This amendment was just filed. So we would like a little time to make sure exactly what the effect would be.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman would yield further, I understand what the gentleman is saying. As you know, the prior Istook amendment on nonprofits came out of the Committee on Appropriations. None of us thought we should be doing this in the authorizing committee, which is why I did not offer it. But since this body adopted it on the Labor, HHS and Education amendments, it seemed to me only fair we do the same kind of thing, and our research makes it look like it is an absolute mirror image. It just takes the Istook amendment, which basically I am opposed to, and I would be opposed to shutting off speech, but we did it. It seems to me only fair then that we do it for the for-profits. That is all I am trying to do as we proceed here.

So the reason we did not do it in the other forum was that we had no idea appropriations was going to start legislating on appropriation bills. So we have no choice but to do the same.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The difference is the nonprofits that we are talking about do not have all of this law that relate to them, where the Defense Department does, and I just need to check and make sure that we have something that is not going to be flying up against another law.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, again, what I understand where we are is we have about 15 minutes to look at this. Then we can reoffer it, and, hopefully, you can accept it at that point.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Before we do that, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] was on his feet, and I think he wanted to engage in this conversation. We might want to do that before we withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. I just wanted to add my request to withdraw and see if we could not work something out on it. It is a complicated subject. It is a comprehensive amendment, which certainly in committee I opposed the Istook amendment because of my concern for that issue, and I would ask the

gentlewoman to withdraw the amendment and see if we cannot work something out.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, based upon the agreement of both of the gentlemen, I certainly will be more than happy to withdraw it under the condition I can reoffer it, hopefully, in a few minutes where we can work something out.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn, without prejudice.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 73.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALLAHAN: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 8107. LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN VESSEL PROPELLERS AND SHIP PROPULSION SHAFTING.**

(a) Subject to subsection (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure vessel propellers six feet in diameter or greater when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such propellers are not manufactured in the United States and do not incorporate castings that are poured and finished only in the United States.

(b) Subject to subsection (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to procure ship propulsion shafting when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such ship propulsion shafting is not manufactured in the United States.

(c) The limitation in subsection (a) or subsection (b), as the case may be, does not apply when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that adequate domestic supplies of propellers described in subsection (a) or of ship propulsion shafting are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to insert a buy American clause that has been in existence for a great number of years. This buy American clause had to do with propellers, and it was in the 1994 appropriations bill and authorization bill, and for some reason it was left out of the 1995-96 appropriation bill.

But I think it is very important that we recognize that this is an opportunity to spend money in the United States, an opportunity to create jobs here in the United States.

We have a letter from the Department of the Navy dated August 22, 1994, that certainly agrees with the purpose of this, because they fear if we do not include this, that we are going to lose the capability then, in the event of any emergency, to have the capability of developing propellers greater than 6 feet in diameter.

The 1994 future years plan called for the construction of 48 ships, and the Navy's fiscal year 1996 plan calls for only the construction of 28 ships.

Since the Navy's report, one fully integrated ship propeller manufacturer has gone out of business. Today there are only two fully integrated propeller manufacturers left in the United States with the capability to design, cast, and machine large monoblock propellers and propeller blades for the U.S. Navy. The Navy's report specifically states that these specialized technologies, processes, skills, and facilities required for the manufacture, including both casting and finish machining, for blades and monoblock propellers, is critical to maintaining an adequate U.S. industrial base to support current and future Navy requirements.

Without this law, the only Navy manufacturer of controllable pitch propellers which go on the majority of our Navy's surface ships will be forced to close its foundry and lay off many of its skilled workers. The reason is simple: Foreign foundries do not have to comply with the same quality controls and environmental regulations imposed on them as foundries operating in the United States. That is the primary reason for not being able to compete with foreign countries, is they do not have to comply with the environmental regulations and the quality control regulations that we have in this country.

If foreign companies want to manufacture propellers for the U.S. Navy, they should come to the United States, open a manufacturing plant and manufacture them and thus be eligible to help provide them.

I do not believe that our country, for the defense-critical systems, should be dependent on foreign sources only. In a time of national emergency, a foreign source may be unreliable or nonexistent.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy regarding the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a strong supporter of "Buy America" as well as being a member whose district is home to the Navy's propeller shop and foundry, I wish to clarify the intent of the gentleman's amendment.

I intend to support the gentleman's amendment, and urge my colleagues to support it.

However, I would like the gentleman's assurance that it is not the purpose of this amendment to weaken America's national security position by eliminating or downsizing the propeller shop and foundry in Philadelphia. I believe it would jeopardize our national security if we were to sole-source propeller manufacturing in the private sector.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am aware that the propeller shop and foundry have been

recognized as a core mission by the Navy. The Navy has stated that it is critical to our national security that it remain operational in support of the fleet.

This amendment would not challenge the Navy's position on the Philadelphia propeller shop and foundry. Its intent is not to cause the closure or downsizing in any way, shape or form of this great facility.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I speak in support of the gentleman's amendment. I think he is raising a very important issue, but obviously, as you know, the issue goes well beyond propellers.

During the last 2 fiscal years, the U.S. Defense Department has spent at least \$13 billion in American taxpayer money to buy goods and services from foreign suppliers. My strong hope would be that the gentleman and I and other people who are concerned about this issue can work together to put an end to these practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would just make the point that in the State of Vermont, in the last 3 years we have had four instances, four instances where contracts were made with companies in Vermont but the products were produced abroad. So the gentleman is beginning to touch upon an issue of enormous consequence.

I had an amendment which I am going to withdraw, but I would hope that we can work together to demand, wherever possible, and I think it is a lot more possible than people think, that if we are going to spend American taxpayers' money for defense equipment, for God's sakes, let us have this work done in America and put American workers to work to do that.

□ 1530

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

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Just very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of the Callahan amendment to require the components of vessels for the Department of Defense to be manufactured in the United States. This amendment makes very good sense. I will not elaborate with details, but I applaud the gentleman for offering the amendment. This is good for our national defense policy, it is good for American jobs. I hope the Callahan amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Callahan amendment to require that components for vessels of the Department of Defense be manufactured in the United States. This amendment makes good sense and has largely been included in the House-passed Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1996.

We all know that our defense readiness is in part dependent on our industrial capability to manufacture defense systems. Without this base, we could find ourselves totally dependent on foreign sources, which could be unreliable and possibly nonexistent in time of national emergency. This base, however, may be in jeopardy unless Congress enacts this domestic source statute.

It is troubling when the Clinton administration uses international armaments cooperation as a justification for not supporting American defense manufacturers—the very manufacturers and employees who tax dollars finance the DOD budget. Procuring U.S. manufactured products for defense purposes advances our technological edge, and sustains the U.S. industrial base and the employment base upon which our security depends.

I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. 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. CALLAHAN: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds provided in title II of this Act for "FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION" may be obligated or expended to finance housing for any individual when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such individual was a member of the military forces of the Soviet Union or that such individual is or was a member of the military forces of the Russian Federation.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, once again, and I have risen so many times in the last several years talking about the very ill-conceived program that the administration fostered in creating an ability of the United States to fund houses for Russian soldiers.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with this.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

Mr. NEUMANN. 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. NEUMANN: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year shall be obligated or expended for costs incurred by the participation of United States Armed Forces units in any operation in the territory of the former Yugoslavia above the level of forces so deployed as of date of enactment.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I have this recurring fear that I am going to wake up one morning, turn on the news and find out the President—

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] is too late in that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has already been recognized.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I have this recurring fear that I am going to wake up one morning, turn on the news, and find out the President of the United States has deployed 25,000 United States troops to the Bosnian region. That is why I have an amendment to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to require the President to come to Congress for approval prior to the deployment of United States troops in the Bosnian area.

My colleagues, make no mistake about the fact that there are plans on the table currently to deploy 25,000 United States ground troops in the Bosnian area.

On June 14, and I quote Secretary Perry; he said there are three different possible ways, and I quote, "There are three possible contingencies in which we would have ground forces in Bosnia. There are, No. 1, a peacekeeping operation to enforce a peacekeeping settlement; No. 2, assisting NATO allies in the full withdrawal of the U.N. Protection Force; and, No. 3, an emergency extraction of the U.N. Protection Force."

General Shali, who also testified at that same hearing, continued to lay out how many troops might be deployed and for how long, and I quote General Shali, same day:

"In the event of a request from the U.N. for assistance in withdrawal of UNPROFOR troops the U.S. would commit about 25,000 American troops for approximately 22 weeks. In the event a situation arises that requires an emergency extraction the NATO plan has a quick response force using selected NATO forces that are in close proximity to Bosnia. American participation and support of this plan are essential."

So, my colleagues see there are plans on the table currently for the deployment of, the potential of deployment of, 25,000 United States ground troops in the Bosnian area for a 22-week period of time. Again I have to reiterate my concern that one morning I will turn on the news and find out that 25,000 United States troops have, in

fact, been deployed to the Bosnian region. After that I will have to explain to my constituents back home from Racine and Kenosha and Janesville-Beliot, WI, why their sons and daughters have been sent to the Bosnian region.

Many of my colleagues believe that the President alone has the authority to call the shots in this particular debate. However, our Founding Fathers gave us the responsibility to participate in these discussions, discussions that are literally life-and-death discussions to many young people in uniform.

The Speaker of the House clearly laid out our role in this in a June 7 address to the House of Representatives when he said, and I quote:

"You want to cut off troops for Haiti or Somalia, or you want to cut off troops in Bosnia. There is an easy way to do it. It is called the power of the purse."

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

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I have talked to the gentleman at great length about this amendment, and I have a substitute to the amendment which I think would satisfy certainly me and, I hope, would satisfy the chairman, which would eliminate the extraction part of it from the amendment that the gentleman is offering, because I think it is so important that we have a commitment to the U.N., but, if I could offer this amendment to the amendment, maybe we could continue the colloquy.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] for that purpose.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURTHA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] would have to yield back his time in order for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to offer his amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURTHA to the amendment offered by Mr. NEUMANN: At the end of the amendment add the following: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to emergency air rescue operations, the airborne delivery of humanitarian supplies, or the planning and execution of OPLAN 40104 to extract UNPROFOR personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and myself have talked at great length, as has the chairman of the committee.

This is a very delicate situation. We know that the White House, whether it is Republican or Democrat, always opposes any kind of stipulation restricting their ability to deploy troops. But I agree with the gentleman that we have not only the right, but the obligation, to insist on authorization before troops are deployed in a humanitarian sense. I do not agree if it is a national security issue; I believe the President does have the ability under the Constitution.

I would hope that the gentleman would accept this amendment. We could take this to conference, and, if the chairman would accept this amendment, then we would be able to then work out the final language with the White House which would give us some leverage over what happens in the future in these humanitarian deployments.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. Chairman, in the last several years the members of our subcommittee have done everything we possibly could to keep this from becoming an American war, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has been a very strong advocate of that. However, we do have to recognize, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned, our commitment to the United Nations. I would mention in addition our very strong treaty commitment to our NATO allies, and, if our NATO allies become embroiled or endangered, we do have a commitment to come to their rescue.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is a good amendment. It makes the overall legislation acceptable and certainly would, I believe, fit within the realm of the Constitution, and so I would hope also that the gentleman would be willing to accept this amendment and that we can just get on to the next item.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, just so I fully understand what is being proposed here, what we are saying is that the President would be required to come to Congress to request funds prior to deploying troops for the peacekeeping, for the enforcement of the peacekeeping settlement, as described by Secretary Perry on June 14, but he would not have to come to request funds to aid in the withdrawal of the French, British, the Dutch, our allies, in the area.

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

Mr. NEUMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. That is correct, and the gentleman has to understand, of course, obviously this does not go in effect until the bill is passed and signed with the President, and we know there will have to be such negotiation before it is finalized.

Mr. NEUMANN. I would be willing to accept the amendment, but I would like to just add that I have some very strong reservations even in those situations of deploying U.S. troops in the region.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. 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. SKELTON: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated or expended for the provision by the United States of military training for military forces of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I bring this issue to the floor of this House because it involves the potential problem of American military forces being where Americans do not want them to be.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are negotiations ongoing at the present time, and I realize that this is a sensitive area of discussion, though I am convinced that I am right, and I will use my few moments on this floor to speak of this issue.

This amendment which I offered states that none of the funds provided in this act may be obligated or expended for the provision by the United States of military training for military forces of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. We all know that the measure known as the Dole amendment passed. What the future of that will be after a veto I cannot say. But I do know that the lifting of the embargo would allow the Bosnia and Herzegovina Government to purchase arms and undoubtedly purchase many of them from us. They are not artillery oriented. They are infantry strong. The Bosnian Serbs are artillery strong, and these weapons that the Moslem Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina would purchase obviously would require people to train them and teach them how to use them.

The question is who would that be? If they buy arms from us, undoubtedly it

would be members of our military force, and this is what concerns me. These Bosnian and Herzegovinan Moslem soldiers will not be coming to Fort Sill, OK, to be learning how to shoot artillery. It will be done in country, in all probability trained by American soldiers. This concerns me a great deal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, because there are sensitive negotiations going on at this time, I raise this issue so that the Members of this body will understand my deep concern. I say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that the Balkans are not worth the life of one American soldier. This lifting of the embargo, unless my amendment would prevail, it allows Americans to go in and train, and if some of that does not work, they might become advisers, and then we see Vietnam all over again.

□ 1545

Because of the sensitivity of this and the negotiations at this time, subject to the opportunity at a future date to offer this issue and debate it fully, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment because of the concerns for the sensitivity of the various negotiations that are ongoing.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I would like to point out to the gentleman from Missouri, who is one of the House's leading experts in the field of national defense and our national security, that the subcommittee spent a lot of time reviewing this entire matter. I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues the fact that the bill before us has seven pages of restrictions and direction as to the proper relationship between the President and the Congress on the issue of deployments for peacekeeping or whatever other purpose.

I appreciate the gentleman withdrawing his amendment, because actually the language in this bill is really very good and has been very well thought out.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to our chairman of the subcommittee, and by the way, the gentleman does an excellent job and I appreciate it, and I am glad that the subcommittee reviewed this issue, because I am deeply concerned that one thing will lead to another and if there are not proper restrictions, if there is not proper language, we could very well find ourselves involved where we do not intend ourselves to be involved.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 7 to title VIII.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARR: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended in a total amount in excess of \$6,700,000 for the relocation, as a result of the report of the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, of the activity of the Army Operational Test and Experimentation Command that is located at Fort Hunter Liggett, California, as of July 1, 1995.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and I understand it may not be in order. However, I believe my amendment addresses an important issue, and I would like to speak briefly on the matter before withdrawing the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents the Army from wasting Federal tax dollars to implement a recommendation by the BRAC Commission. The recommendation would relocate the TEXCOM Experimentation Center from my district to another facility. In their proposal to the BRAC, the Army claimed this move would cost no more than \$6.7 million. It is this figure which BRAC used as a basis for its final recommendation to move the facility. However, there are Army documents that show that it may cost as much in fact as \$13 million or more.

Mr. Chairman, let me quote from a recent U.S. Army Forces Command document which states that "Significant one-time costs are \$17 million for realignment. There are no savings to be realized in this action."

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to hold the Army to its word that the relocation of TEXCOM would be cost-effective and save money important to the American taxpayers. If, as the Army claims, they can move TEXCOM for only \$6.7 million despite their own estimates, then my amendment would change nothing. If, however, the Army attempts to convince BRAC to move the facility by raising it one figure and then raid the defense budget to meet the cost of the second higher figure, then my amendment would prevent such a move. In short, my amendment requires the Army to keep their word.

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

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, the BRAC Commission voted to realign an experimentation unit from Fort Hunter Liggett to Fort Bliss, TX under an assumption that it would save the

American taxpayers close to \$68 million over the next 20 years, we have information that shows it will cost the taxpayers over \$120 million to realign this facility—a simple \$188 million error above what the BRAC Commissioners were led to believe.

The Commission was also led to believe that there would be a one time cost of \$6.7 million to realign this base when in actuality it will cost closer to \$43 million—over six times the projected one time cost.

I believe the realignment of this base weakens the best military training facility available to our service members. I also believe that the goal of saving taxpayer money by this realignment has not been met.

In addition, I believe the BRAC Commission did not have the best data on which to base their decision. It is for these reasons I support this amendment which would require the Army to realign Fort Hunter Liggett for the amount of money the BRAC Commission based its decision.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for his important help in this matter. I look forward to working with him in the future on this problem.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to title VIII.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire if this is the identical amendment that was previously offered?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is the identical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 8107. (a) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY CONTRACTORS FOR POLITICAL ADVOCACY.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by any Federal contractor for an activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence Federal, State, or local legislation or agency action, including any of the following:

(A) Monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similar activity.

(B) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through an attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any segment thereof, including any communication between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(C) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through communication with any member or employee of a legislative body or agency, or with any government official or employee who may participate in the formulation of the legislation or agency action, including any communication

between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to engage in such an attempt or to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(2) Participating or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office, including monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similar activity.

(3) Participating in any judicial litigation or agency proceeding (including as an amicus curiae) in which agents or instrumentalities of Federal, State, or local governments are parties, other than litigation in which the contractor or potential contractor is a defendant appearing in its own behalf; is defending its tax-exempt status; or is challenging a government decision or action directed specifically at the powers, rights, or duties of that contractor or potential contractor.

(4) Allocating, disbursing, or contributing any funds or in-kind support to any individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for political advocacy for the previous Federal fiscal year exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO AWARD CONTRACTS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to award a contract when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the expenditures of the potential contractor (other than an individual person) for activities described in subsection (a) for any one of the previous five Federal fiscal years (excluding any fiscal year before 1996) exceeded the sum of—

(A) the first \$20,000,000 of the difference between the potential contractor's total expenditures made in the fiscal year and the total amount of Federal contracts and grants it was awarded in that fiscal year, multiplied by .05; and

(2) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract to purchase or secure any goods or services (including dues and membership fees) from any other individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for activities described in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1995 exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year; or

(3) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract for a purpose (other than to purchase or secure goods or services) that was not specifically permitted by Congress in the law authorizing the contract.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The activities described in subsection (a) do not include an activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Making available the results of non-partisan analysis, study, research, or debate.

(2) Providing technical advice or assistance (where such advice would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action) to a government body or to a committee or other subdivision there in response to a written request by such body or subdivision, as the case may be.

(3) Communications between a contractor and its employees with respect to legislation, proposed legislation, agency action, or proposed agency action of direct interest to the contractor and such employees. Other than communications described in subparagraph (c).

(4) Any communication with a government official or employee, other than—

(A) a communication with a member or employee of a legislative body or agency

(where such communication would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action); or

(B) a communication the principal purpose of which is to influence legislation or agency action.

(5) Official communication by employees of State or local governments, or by organizations whose membership consists exclusively of State or local governments.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I think this is a terribly important amendment in that it does for profits what we did to nonprofits earlier this year in an appropriation bill.

Earlier this year, the Istook amendment was adopted by this House, and what it did was say that groups, and there are over 460 of them, such as the American Cancer Society, the American Red Cross, the American Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Baptist Joint Committee, the United States Catholic Conference, the YMCA, the YWCA, March of Dimes, Multiple Sclerosis, and on and on and on, would not be allowed to use their own funds to lobby in the Congress. This was called defunding of those groups, and that was thought to be very fair. If that is fair, then it is certainly fair to say to profit groups that are getting huge Government contracts that they also should not be using their funds to lobby Congress in this manner.

Now, this amendment is written in exactly the same form as the Istook amendment. It is a limitation on the use of Federal funds by contractors for political advocacy, which means obviously coming to a Federal contractor, having any activity which would be made known to a Federal official or having the authority to obligate or approve or vote for funds that would benefit them. I think this is terribly important, and I certainly, certainly hope that we can in fairness do for the profits what we did for the nonprofits, or I think a lot of people are going to say wait a minute, wait a minute. If you are a nonprofit, do-good group that is collecting it for dues, that is one thing. However, if you are out there and you are making big profits, then you can do whatever you want to with Federal money to lobby to get more of it. I think that would really tilt the scales of justice. All of this is about making sure the scales are even.

Mr. Chairman, I would say after we adopted the Istook amendment on the nonprofits that we certainly should be adopting the Schroeder amendment on the profit side in this area, and I hope we can get a strong aye vote and move on.

Mr. Chairman, today I intend to offer an amendment that would crack down on defense special interests. Recently, this chamber voted to limit the ability of nonprofit organizations to lobby. The provision, Representative ISTOOK's amendment to the Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill, limits the ability of recipients of Federal grants to lobby with their non-Federal funds.

While I voted against this limitation on the floor based on constitutional grounds, I recognize the writing on the wall. The majority of this Chamber believes that the ability of special interests to peddle their influence should be seriously curtailed. Assuming that this provision may become the law of the land, shouldn't it then include the real special interests, that is, defense contractors?

Lockheed Martin is now the Nation's largest defense contractor. Their total revenues amounted to \$22,900,000,000, 62.9 percent of their revenues were derived from defense-based revenues. In 1994, they received \$9 billion in prime contracts from the Department of Defense.

Another example? The political action committee for Northrop Grumman and the major B-2 subcontractors contributed \$150,850 in the first 6 months of 1995 to 115 Republican Members of the House. They organized subcontractors to lobby their own State delegations. They organized and paid for fact-finding trips for Members, and invited staff to their B-2 factory in California. The result? The House committees authorized and appropriated \$553 million and \$493 million respectively for the first installment of 20 new B-2 airplanes, which, according to the GAO, can't tell the difference between a mountain and rain.

Which do you think peddles more influence, nonprofits or defense contractors? It is not the YMCA, the Girl Scouts, the Sierra Club, or the Children's Defense Fund. Influence in this town is bought and sold. Logically, it follows that the most influence resides with the most money—the contractors. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. Support my effort to create equity between nonprofit and for-profit lobbyists.

#### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS FROM DEFENSE FIRMS

##### LOCKHEED

1995-96—Democrats: \$0, Republicans: \$59,400 (37 Candidates), Total: \$59,400.

1993-94—Democrats: \$338,210 (128 Candidates), Republicans: \$254,401 (120 Candidates), Total: \$592,611.

##### MCDONNELL DOUGLAS

1995-96—Democrats: \$31,000 (37 Candidates), Republicans: \$57,749 (70 Candidates), Total: \$88,749.

1993-94—Democrats: \$160,350 (111 Candidates), Republicans: \$80,150 (72 Candidates), Total: \$240,500.

##### NORTHROP GRUMMAN

1993-94—Democrats: \$94,555 (70 Candidates), Republicans: \$51,050 (46 Candidates), Total: \$146,355.

##### LITTON INDUSTRIES

1995-96—Democrats: \$9,500 (13 Candidates), Republicans: \$19,299 (26 Candidates), Total: \$28,799.

1993-94—Democrats: \$52,700 (40 Candidates), Republicans: \$60,400 (44 Candidates), Total: \$113,100.

##### GENERAL DYNAMICS

1995-96—Democrats: \$33,050 (35 Candidates), Republicans: \$74,700 (56 Candidates), Total: \$107,750.

1993-94—Democrats: \$235,862 (106 Candidates), Republicans: \$149,250 (74 Candidates), Total: \$385,112.

#### 1994 Defense Firm Revenue from Sales to U.S. Government

Lockheed, \$16.564 billion (Lockheed's revenue has also been shown to be \$14.4 billion). McDonnell Douglas Corp., \$9.2 billion. Northrop Grumman, \$5.41 billion.

Litton Industries, \$3.16 billion.

General Dynamics, \$2.862 billion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know it is a thoughtful amendment and on first glance, it probably looks like a good idea. After all, what is good for the goose is good for the gander if you are dealing with apples and apples and oranges and oranges and that sort of thing. The fact is we are not. We are dealing with apples and oranges. We are dealing with two entirely different concepts.

One is a concept of direct agency, if you will. When the U.S. Government contracts with a public charitable organization to provide charitable services to the American people or abroad, in effect that charitable organization becomes the agent of the U.S. Government. It is taking U.S. taxpayers' money exclusively, subtracts an administration surcharge which they do not pay taxes on, then dispenses what is left to the eligible recipient, to the person who is in need, or to the group of people that are in need.

That is legitimate. That is a legitimate function of Government, and it is perfectly acceptable and should be encouraged. The agency is exclusively taking nonprofit money or money from the American taxpayer to render service to a beneficiary, and any money that they divert for their own costs should not be used to go back and lobby for more money that is in effect not the purpose for which the money was intended in the first place.

In other words, it is a diversion of money, Mr. Chairman. It is a diversion from the purpose for which the money was intended. The money was intended to go to the beneficiary, not to the agency to lobby for more money. The agency is supposed to administer taxpayers' money for some good, altruistic purpose.

In the case of the contractor, there is no agency. A defense contractor is like any other contractor, and I do not know why the gentlewoman stopped at defense contractors. I do not know why she did not just go out and say any time the U.S. Government contracts with anybody for a product or service for the Government's use you cannot lobby.

But, if she did that, No. 1, is a denial of the privilege of the first amendment, which is the right of speech under the Constitution of the United States, to exercise their opportunity to speak to their government, to the representatives of their choice, because in fact you would be applying it to everybody in America. But since you have limited it to just defense contractors or just individuals who provide services or goods to the U.S. Government for the purposes of defense, it is not everybody, it is just tens of millions of people.

Now, we already have title X of the United States Code for the Armed Forces, which deals with all of the ac-

tivities affecting contracts between vendors in the defense arena and the U.S. Government. In fact, this document here, title X, is something like 16,000 pages thick. Well, I do not know how many pages. It is thick. I do not think anyone will deny that.

That is a compilation of law accruing over the last 30 or 40 years. The last time I checked, the gentlewoman from Colorado has been on the Committee on National Security for the last 18 to 20 years, and so she has played a vital role in affecting this document. I do not recall that she has come forward and said that no contractor in the defense arena cannot lobby, or can lobby the U.S. Government until now, but she may have. But she is doing it now, and she is entitled to do it. But let us not get confused. Anybody who renders products or services to the Government for profit is a private individual, is a private contractor, is working for a living, making products, rendering services, just like any private individual in this country, and does not depend for his income exclusively on the American taxpayer is not a salaried employee of the American taxpayer, is not an agent of the American taxpayer or the American Government.

The other instance in which Mr. Istook offered the amendment earlier in another bill is a system, or is an instance of agency versus contract for hire.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LIVINGSTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with agency versus contract for hire, contract for products. There is a real distinction, and to say to anybody who is a contractor who deals with the Federal Government that you cannot lobby is in essence, frankly, to deny their rights under the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States and totally flies in the face of any constitutional principles that I know of.

□ 1600

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me answer why it only applies to defense contractors, and that is because of the scope of this bill which I know the gentleman understands. I obviously cannot do it for the universe because we are within this context only, so that is easy.

Let me then go on and say I do not think that what we are trying to say here is not that they cannot lobby, it is that they cannot use Federal funds that they are getting for this to keep lobbying to get more. It is like once you get in the trough, you just keep getting more to feed more, which was what the concern was, I think, in the Istook amendment when people were

concerned that some of the agencies might use some of the Federal money that was supposed to go to beneficiaries instead of lobbying to get more.

Mr. Chairman, I think the analysis here is rather similar. We want the analysis to be on a threat based by neutral people rather than people who got a lot of money to manufacture something or make something, then trying to find out more reasons and spend the same money to spin more reasons to convince us we should buy even more for them. That is a heck of a deal. That is a heck of a deal.

Those regulations you are showing, this person has been trying for 20 years to find ways to close that door. We have never been able to really close that door very well. That is why I am saying doing the mirror image of what we did to nonprofits makes an awful lot of sense because maybe it will then be clear across the board and very fair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LIVINGSTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would allow me to clarify something, is it her intent with this amendment to say that no contractor will use Federal funds but will not be denied the right to lobby by using their own private funds?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this is titled "limitation on the use of Federal funds by contractors for political advocacy." I do not know how you can be any clearer than that. That is the title of this.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, lots of titles of lots of bills and lots of amendments are deceiving as much as we might intend it otherwise. I specifically would like the gentlewoman to express her intent, her individual intent, the author of this amendment's intent. Would a contractor who expressly uses his or her, or its own money, private money, be entitled to lobby under her amendment?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is correct, because what my amendment says is that it is a limitation on the use of Federal funds to award contracts. None of the funds made available by this act, this act, period. That is about as clear as I know how to make it. Funds made available by this act, which is the defense act going to defense contractors, can be used to go out and lobby for more next year. What we are really saying is the money we are allocating today goes for weapons, not for a way to make sure you get in next year's bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, next year the money becomes privatized once it become awarded. I understand the intent, but once money is earned on a contract, it becomes private. How does one determine whether or not that is money from this act, this particular contract?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LIVINGSTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, again, all of those regulations are about the fact that they have to show their costs. We know, if anything, we probably have too many regulations overregulating, making sure we know that. We make sure we have all sorts of people doing oversight everywhere in the Defense Department because we do not just let them guess what it is going to cost and then find out they spent half the money to go out on a cruise instead. We know we are supposed to be doing that oversight. So that is how we know and I think it is very clear.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if it is the gentlewoman's express intent not to deny private individuals, private corporations, from using their own private funds for lobbying the U.S. Congress, and that her intent is exclusively to deny the right of use of Federal funds for lobbying, then I withdraw my objection.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am delighted that the gentleman from Louisiana withdrew his objection. That is my intent and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available for the National Foreign Intelligence program (other than for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund) from the appropriations provided in this Act shall not exceed 90 percent of the amount made available for such Agencies (other than for such Fund) from the appropriations provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1995 (Pub. L. 103-335).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which is co-sponsored by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and should be supported, although I doubt that it will, by all deficit hawks and those of us who are concerned about a cost-effective government. It cuts funding for the national foreign intelligence program by 10 percent. That is a 10-percent cut in funding for the CIA, and it is a 10-percent cut to the intelligence activities and the Drug Enforcement Administration, the FBI, the National Reconnaissance

Office, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and other intelligence agencies.

Mr. Chairman, again, let me reiterate that this does not cut the funding for the entire agency. It merely cuts the funding for their intelligence gathering activities.

I would also like to point out that this amendment does not cut intelligence funding for war-time operations. Both tactical and joint military intelligence are not cut. This amendment does not compromise our military strength.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not affect the CIA retirement and disability fund.

Recent articles in the Washington Post and other publications estimate that the entire intelligence budget is approximately \$29 billion. According to information from a variety of publications and from public documents, about \$16 billion of that budget goes to the national foreign intelligence program. That means that this amendment, if adopted, would save the taxpayers of America about \$1.6 billion, and even in Washington that is a lot of money.

Mr. Chairman, how do we explain to the American people that Congress is considering major cuts in Medicare, which will have a disastrous impact on the lives of many elderly people; major cuts in Medicaid, which will hurt senior citizens and low-income people; major cuts in student loans, in education; major cutbacks in nutrition programs, in housing and in the environment and a variety of other programs which will impact on tens of millions of people in the middle class, the working class, the elderly, low-income people. How do we say that we can go forward in those areas but, despite the end of the cold war, despite the fact that the Soviet Union no longer exists, that we cannot make at least a 10-percent cut in the intelligence budget and save the taxpayers \$1.6 billion?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as we find ourselves in a world where there are more and more intelligence targets popping up every day, it is not a good idea to further reduce our intelligence budget. Now, I say further reduce because we have already reduced this budget by 16 percent since 1990. We have far less intelligence spending today than we did during Desert Storm. The intelligence community work force is going through a significant downsizing. In the next three fiscal years the work force will be 23 percent smaller than it was in 1990.

The Sanders amendment would affect the intelligence community's ability to support policymakers, military leaders at the national, theater, and tactical levels and law enforcement officials. It could impact critical support to deployed military commanders and tactical forces such as those in Bosnia;

critical investments in satellite collection initiatives that are intended to aid our deployed military forces, counternarcotics, international crime and counterterrorism collection, and analytical capabilities would all be affected; as well as our ability to keep pace with the telecommunications developments which are growing dramatically. We cannot afford to do this.

Mr. Chairman, our intelligence budget is already, in my opinion, below the level where it should be. What are some of the targets? What are some of the areas where we have to have intelligence if we are going to protect the U.S. interests and U.S. personnel. Bosnia is the very obvious location. Iraq is very obvious. North Korea, has been in the media for months as well as Russia and the former Soviet states. Libya and Syria have terrorism groups who have threatened the United States interests. Those who would proliferate nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons, and we cannot deny the fact that these are all happening. We have to know where and how.

Drugs. Narcotics. The post-cold-war environment. When the Berlin Wall came down and the Iron Curtain melted, we all breathed a sigh of relief and thought, hey, the world will be a beautiful place, full of peace. But while we are still applauding ourselves, up out of the sands of the desert comes Saddam Hussein.

We have to have intelligence. The United States, being the Nation that we are, we have to have adequate intelligence. And I say again, in this bill, we have reduced the intelligence budget to a level actually below where I think it ought to be. A further 10 percent cut just is not acceptable.

Mr. Chairman, as much as I agreed with and supported the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] on his earlier amendment, I have to oppose this one with equal fervor because this would be extremely dangerous.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope the taxpayers are listening very carefully. Taxpayers are angry and they have good reason to be angry. We are paying too much taxes. Taxes should be lowered for families and individuals, while we raise taxes for corporations. Families and individuals are paying something like 44 percent of the tax burden. Corporations are only paying 11 percent, but that is a discussion for another time.

The other way we deal with the way our money is being handled is by streamlining and downsizing and cutting out waste in Government. Here is a concrete example of extreme waste in Government. We cannot talk about concrete figures because they will not give them to us, but there is general agreement. Nobody ever challenges the figure, but the overall intelligence budget is about \$28 billion, no less than \$28 billion. We are talking today about one portion of it which deals with information gathering activities related

to the military which everybody agrees is no less than \$16 billion.

In previous amendments we have called for a 10-percent cut in the overall intelligence budget, and that would have been \$2.8 billion, or a 10-percent cut for 1 year. And then we said over a 7-year period of course that adds up to much more.

This is a reasonable amendment, very reasonable. As the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] pointed out, it does not apply in wartime. A number of things are exempted. It is understood that we need an intelligence operation. Nobody is saying we do not need it.

What we are saying is that, while we are streamlining, while we are downsizing, while we are going after military pensions and the pensions of Government employees, while we are cutting Medicare, while we are cutting Medicaid, while we have just cut the budget of the title I program for education by \$1.1 billion, while we have cut out the whole summer youth employment program, while we are doing all this, then let us look at a piece of waste in this budget which is obvious. It is obvious that we do not need the CIA at the same level as we had it before.

□ 1615

The gentleman before us said, and I will take him for his word, he said we have cut it by 16 percent since 1990. If half of the total activities of the CIA budget were dedicated to the Soviet Union, the evil empire, a major opponent, the other superpower, it used to be the other superpower, a real threat, half of the intelligence budget was dedicated to the Soviet Union, if half of the budget was dedicated to the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union is no longer that kind of threat, then surely we can cut the budget.

If Members say the Soviet Union does not exist anymore, the fragments of the Soviet Union still constitute some kind of threat, let us cut the budget not by half, let us cut it by 25 percent. That is reasonable, instead of 16 percent, let us cut it by 25 percent, which means we have some more cutting to do. We can cut.

We are talking about very real money, that if it is not cut here, will be cut from somewhere else. We can use this \$1.6 billion a year. The \$1.6 billion per year could be used to replace the \$1.1 billion we just cut from the title I program for children's education. That is where we need the intelligence.

Our intelligence budget should be increased in the area of education. Nothing is more significant, nothing is more important for the security of the Nation than an informed population, than a well-educated population. The brain power of America will decide whether we remain a superpower and the leader of the world, or not.

That brain power is suffering right now because we just cut it \$1.1 billion.

Here is an opportunity to make a cut where it should be, \$1.6 billion, out of the intelligence budget. What does the intelligence budget do? The present budget, it is bloated, and because it is bloated, because there is too much bureaucracy, because they do not have enough things to do, they get into situations like the Aldrich Ames situation.

This should be called, partially, the Aldrich Ames Cleansing Act. Aldrich Ames, who had a high place in the CIA, for years did nothing but destructive activities. He carried on a whole series of destructive activities for many years, for which he was paid millions of dollars by the enemies he was supposed to have been spying upon. Aldrich Ames could get away with that because it had no significance. It had significance in terms of the people who died, agents who were in the service of this country died as a result of Aldrich Ames' treacherous activities, but it did not have any significance on peace or war in the world. It had no significance with respect to the security of the United States. We do not need to keep spending \$16 billion in this particular area and \$28 billion overall for the CIA. We can cut the intelligence budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more strongly with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations. I might also mention the gentleman from Florida is a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

I could not any more eloquently outline why we should not accept this amendment. Rather than repeat a number of the things that the gentleman from Florida said, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to do is to quote from a speech which the President, Mr. Clinton, made to employees of the Central Intelligence Agency recently on a visit that he made there.

Today, because the Cold War is over, some say that we should and can step back from the world and that we don't need intelligence as much as we used to; that we ought to severely cut the intelligence budget. A few have even urged us to scrap the central intelligence service.

I think these views are profoundly wrong. I believe making deep cuts in intelligence during peacetime is comparable to canceling your health insurance when you're feeling fine. We are living in a moment of hope. Our Nation is at peace. Our economy is growing all right. All around the world, democracy and free markets are on the march. But none of these developments are inevitable or irreversible.

Now, instead of a single enemy, we face a host of scattered and dangerous challenges. They are quite profound and difficult to understand. There are ethnic and regional tensions that threaten to flare into full-scale war in more than 30 nations. Two dozen countries are trying to get their hands on nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. As these terrible tools of destruction spread, so too spreads the potential for terrorism and for criminals to acquire them. And drug

trafficking, organized crime, and environmental decay threaten the stability of new and emerging democracies and threaten our well-being here at home.

In the struggle against these forces, you, the men and women of our intelligence community, serve on the front lines. By necessity, a lot of your work is hidden from the headlines. But in recent months alone, you warned us when Iraq massed its troops against the Kuwaiti border. You provided vital support to our peacekeeping and humanitarian missions in Haiti and Rwanda. You helped to strike a blow at a Columbian drug cartel. You uncovered bribes that would have cheated American companies out of billions of dollars. Your work has saved lives and promoted America's prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, those are words from a speech that the President made to employees of the Central Intelligence Agency. I do not normally quote the President. However, I do not think it could be better summed up. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and would urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. Chairman, I am touched by the endorsement of the Republican chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the Clinton policy in this regard, but I have to disagree with it. In fact, we are being told a couple of unbelievable things. Essentially we are being told that the collapse of the Soviet Union means that there is no opportunity to save money in intelligence. We are told there is, after all, Iraq and Iran and Libya. I agree.

I disagree with the implicit assumption that there was no Iraq in 1986, that Libya was created in 1983, and that Iran just floated down. All of those other threats were there at the same time. Ten years ago we were dealing with the terrorist threats in Syria, in Iraq, and Libya. Those were not the Andrews sisters a few years ago who suddenly turned ugly on us. Those countries and the threats they projected were a fact 10 years ago.

We also had, as the primary focus of our national security expenditure, a Soviet Union which led an unwilling empire of many other nations that were being held captive, that threatened our very existence. Yes, there are problems in the world today. There are people who run countries today who in a good world would not even be allowed to drive cars. They mean us harm and we need to defend ourselves.

However, we have succeeded in helping bring about the collapse of our single greatest enemy, so that the vast amounts of money and technology we had to spend to watch the Soviet Union and its capacity to make nuclear war on us, to deal with the Warsaw Pack and the millions of men under arms that threatened us there, they are substantially diminished.

The notion that with this collapse of the major part of the threat there is no grounds for savings is nonsense, but it is not simply abstract nonsense. It is

now nonsense that drives us to say that college students will not get the kind of student loans they used to get, that drives us to say that we cannot afford enforcement in environmental areas, that drives us to take money away, so that public housing projects have recently been told, thanks to the rescission that the other party put through, that needed repairs to elderly housing will have to be deferred.

The argument that we cannot make substantial cuts when the substantial threat has diminished is nonsense. Everything that is now a threat today was a threat 10 years ago. There are no brand new threats in the world. What is new is that we do not have this ongoing likelihood of thermonuclear war, and what we are saying is we believe that at least a 10-percent cut is possible, given the collapse of that central threat.

I was also struck when the chairman of the subcommittee, my elevator buddy that I travel with up and down, said "We have cut 16 percent," because I do not believe we have cut 16 percent in nominal dollars. That is, I do not think the dollar amount today is 16 percent less than what it was. I think he was saying that in real terms it has been cut. That is, it has not been allowed to keep up with inflation.

That is very striking, because my Republican friends in particular, when we are talking about a program that they like, suddenly start talking about real terms, and the failure to keep up with inflation is considered a cut. When they are talking about programs they do not like, that gets reversed.

In fact, there has not been a 16-percent reduction in the dollars. What they are saying is it has not been allowed to keep up with inflation, but it has not been aimed at inflation, it has been aimed at the Soviet Union.

One other point. If any other agency of government had had the kind of disaster that the Central Intelligence Agency had with Aldrich Ames, we would be talking about the need to cut back on their money because they were so badly run. They employed a Russian spy. If HUD had working for it a person who was secretly demolishing good housing, HUD would be held to account. If the NIH had somebody who went around and spread the plague we would say "We have to control them."

The CIA is like the Defense Department. If they screw up badly, this house will reward them with more money, the theory apparently being that since they wasted so much of what we gave them, we had better give them some more to make up for it. It is an absolute reversal of the normal rules. If a domestic agency mispends money, they are in trouble. When others in national security do, they get rewarded. If our national security was at stake, that would be a factor, but in this bill we are ignoring the savings that the American people are entitled to by the collapse of that threat to our national security.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I will say briefly that I feel this is a very reasonable amendment, a very moderate amendment, and in fact, I would make an argument that it is a very conservative amendment. As most people in this House know, I think I have one of the highest percentages of voting with the majority of my party in the years since I have been here.

I know that not many on my side of the aisle will be voting for this amendment, but I am very pleased that many or several leading conservative organizations have voiced support for this, including very strong support from the Citizens for a Sound Economy, because this is a conservative amendment, because it would save a substantial amount of taxpayers' money.

Many of us saw on the front page of the U.S.A. Today a few days ago that our national debt has now reached over \$5 trillion. Alice Rivlin, who is the President's Director of the Office of Management and Budget, put out a memo a few months ago and said we will have yearly losses of over \$1 trillion a year by the year 2010, and over \$5 trillion a year by the year 2030, if we do not make major changes now. This is one area that can be reduced without harmful effect, because even if this amendment goes through, we can still have a very strong, even a lavish intelligence operation in this country.

I favor a strong intelligence operation, but surely to goodness we can have a good, strong intelligence operation with all the many billions that would be left, even if this amendment passed. If this amendment passes, and it is a cut of 10 percent of a little over half of our intelligence operation in this country, if this amendment passes we will still be spending more than twice the annual budget of the entire State of Tennessee for all that it does; and Tennessee, with a little over 5 million people, is exactly typical, and almost exactly average, in all areas of spending compared to other States, all the other States in this country, so we can still have a very active intelligence operation.

Let me tell the Members what some of this money is being spent for. Last year it was reported on the front page of the Washington Post that the National Reconnaissance Office was building a secret building out here in Virginia, spending \$310 million for a 1-million-square-foot building. That is \$310 a square foot, about three times the amount that State governments spend on beautiful buildings all over this country. They are spending in these lavish, ridiculous ways because they are not being held back or not being held accountable in the way that they should be for taxpayer money.

These agencies, our intelligence agencies, unfortunately did not predict

the coming down of the Berlin Wall, they did not predict the breakup of the Soviet Union. They are doing these esoteric studies and benefiting and helping no one, really, other than the bureaucrats who work for these agencies.

Therefore, I think it is time to step back and take another look at some of these agencies, and reduce their spending at the very time that we are downsizing the military. Many people, most people that I represent, would feel that we should really downsize the intelligence operations even more, and perhaps downsize the military of this country a little bit less, so I think this is a very fair, reasonable, amendment, and I urge its support.

□ 1630

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

Mr. Chairman, today's entire debate seems to be an exercise in delusion.

For those who have not been following events in the world, let me repeat something that doesn't seem to be getting through: The cold war is over. And now that the cold war is over, what in the world are we doing increasing the intelligence budget?

We simply have no business doing this at a time when we are slashing funds for Medicare, student aid, and child nutrition.

And, we have no business doing this at a time when the threat we are facing in this world is much reduced.

Mr. Chairman, it's time for this Congress to wake up and snap out of it. The cold war is over. It's time to cut the intelligence budget. This cut is fair, this cut is needed, and this cut should be passed.

The Sanders-Owens amendment saves over 1.5 billion. It needs our support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was listening to the debate and watching the debate from my office when I was compelled to come here, because, as I remember, during the debate on the appropriations bill dealing with education programs, with programs for our working men and women to protect them at the workplace, for health programs for seniors, we made dramatic cuts in some of those programs, in some cases eliminating programs.

For example, we cut out every single dollar that we put in to subsidize seniors' payments of their home heating bills during the times in the winter when it is very expensive, especially on the east coast, to try to heat your home. This is for families, mostly seniors, as I said before, who are on subsidized incomes already and who are finding it very difficult to pay their bills, very expensive heating bills. We saw the case in Chicago recently where 400 people died because they had problems keeping their places cool enough to stay there and live, 400 people dying.

We cut dramatically into those programs, in some cases eliminating. Here

we find that we are increasing a budget, and we cannot say the number because it is a secret, but we are increasing the budget for an operation which in many respects has outlived some of its purpose. The cold war is over. We have all said that.

Certainly we need our intelligence gathering abilities to remain, but we must certainly tighten our belts, and that includes within the intelligence branch of government. Yet we see that we are increasing the amount by something close to \$1 billion, and at least we are trying to cut at least \$1 billion out, to have the pain of cuts go all around.

Let me point out one thing that really disturbs me greatly. During the debate on this education appropriations bill, we dealt with the Head Start Program which helps young children. We were told during the debate by this new congressional majority that we had to cut Head Start programming to the tune of \$137 million. That is what we cut from last year's funding levels. Why? Because we were told in some cases some of the programs that are administering these dollars for our kids were not very efficient. There was some overlap. We could make better use of the dollars, and this was a signal to them that they better shape up.

Yet we learned that with the CIA we are funding assassinations in countries like Guatemala with the assistance of CIA operatives. We find that they are spending \$300 million on lavish offices and buildings, and here we are telling the American people that we have to tighten our belt and cut Head Start \$137 million because the administration has not been as efficient as we would like.

I do not think that makes sense. On a budget that we cannot reveal the numbers to the American people, because it is an intelligence matter, we are saying "Let us increase", but when it comes to real intelligence, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] pointed out, when it comes to our school children, we are willing to cut.

Forty years ago we had a President, Mr. Eisenhower, who said national security of this country relies on having educated people and a society that knows how to work, and for the first time the Federal Government became involved in helping local schools and local State governments fund education.

Ten years later under President Johnson we passed for the first time an education act to really have the Federal Government get involved. Of all the moneys that schools spend, the Federal Government provides about 6 percent of those dollars, a very small amount, but it is more than we used to.

Now we are told we have to cut back on what we spend on our children, because we have to tighten our belt, yet here we are told, "No; you do not have to tighten your belt, spend more, spend more", even though you are telling Head Start folks, "You cannot get

more because you did not administer very efficiently", but the CIA, which helps fund assassinations by CIA operatives, that is OK.

There is something wrong. There is an inconsistency here, and I hope the Members of this body will realize that and vote for this very sound, very well-meaning and, I think, very meaningful way to send a message that everyone must tighten their belt. It is time for us to do it, not just for Head Start but to do it for the intelligence community as well.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just point out to my colleagues that we have made dramatic reductions in the intelligence budget, which is a classified matter and I cannot get into the details of it, but we have cut this budget more than George Bush wanted and much more than Bill Clinton wanted. I think we are on a course to reduce not only personnel but the overall expenditures, part of the major reduction in defense spending.

Sometimes people forget that between 1985 and 1995 we have reduced defense spending by about 38 percent, or \$100 billion in real terms. The intelligence community has taken its proportion of those reductions, as I mentioned, not only in personnel but also in equipment.

This year's bill was put together on a very bipartisan basis. We looked at the needs in all areas of intelligence, and we came up with a number which is classified and I cannot get into, but I think is about as appropriate to the challenge that we are faced with out there.

Departed Director Jim Woolsey talked about the fact that in a post-cold-war era the world is not as safe and comfortable and cozy as a lot of people thought it was going to be. We have got problems throughout the world, and in my judgment the intelligence budget today is at about the right size and, as I have said, dramatically below what George Bush and President Clinton asked for.

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

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman disputes the figures that were given to us by another member of the committee. Sixteen percent was a cut, he said, that has taken place, and you say it is more like a \$100 billion cut?

Mr. DICKS. On the defense appropriations bill. The intelligence budget is a part of the defense appropriations bill. What I was saying first is defense spending has been—

Mr. OWENS. You agree with the 16 percent figure that he gave us?

Mr. DICKS. I am not going to get into a percentage number because I think that may be classified itself. I am just going to say the defense budget

itself has been cut by 37 percent between 1985 and 1995 or about \$100 billion. We are down from \$350 billion to \$250 billion.

If the gentleman would go on with me for one more second, in procurement, we are going to have a procurement readiness problem out there in the future. The cut is from \$135 billion to \$41 billion.

We have been cutting defense very dramatically, and the intelligence budget has been cut as part of that. President Clinton, when he ran for President, talked about cutting it by 1.5 percent per year. We have cut it beyond that. We have cut it more deeply than that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] has been the person who, when he was chairman, made serious cuts in that budget.

Mr. OWENS. We want more money to go to the real defense budget, and not have Aldrich Ames and his colleagues wasting our money, at the same time killing our agents. We think it is being misspent and dangerously wasted in the intelligence operation.

Mr. DICKS. As the gentleman knows, President Clinton has just named Mr. Deutch to come in and be the new director. I as a Democrat feel that John Deutch is very competent, very professional. He has brought in a new management team, he has brought in a whole new top team at the directorate of operations where Mr. Ames resided, and you are right, there were serious problems there.

But to come in here now and say, well, because there were serious problems, we need to take a meat ax approach to the intelligence budget, I do not think is the right approach to it. As I looked at the budget just the other day, and I do not think any of the Members of the House have been up to even look at the classified annex of the budget, that is the only way you can really look and see what is in this budget.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Just tell the American people why it is OK to slash Medicare, education, and Head Start at a time, for example, in terms of education, we know we need more help for education, when at the same time half of the intelligence budget as I understand it went to fight the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union no longer exists. Why can we not make a modest \$1.6 billion reduction in intelligence funding?

Mr. DICKS. I would say to the gentleman, first of all, I share his concern about Medicare, Medicaid, and education, and I did not vote for balanced budget amendment that required a major tax cut which makes it a requirement to cut too deeply into these programs.

But I do believe that we have made serious and significant cuts in the intelligence budget already, in prior

years leading up to this year, and also we have cut the defense budget which the intelligence budget is part of, so I think we have done the job. I think what the gentleman is offering is too severe, goes too far, and is not well thought out.

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

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think the easiest course to take perhaps on this bill would be to support an amendment that would cut the intelligence funding that is so vital for our national security in a time when we are making tough decisions. But our job here in Washington is to look beyond what is the superficially easy answer and decision and to look at what in fact substantively is needed.

I spent the greater part of the break updating myself on what is happening in the former Soviet republics, and I hope my colleagues did the same. I would encourage my colleagues who may not have read what has been called perhaps the most important foreign policy book of this year, to read the book called Zhirinovsky. This book came out in the end of June 1995, and is a very intensely researched document by two leading Russian writers on Vladimir Zhirinovsky, who is leading the National Liberal Democratic Party. Zhirinovsky, as most of our colleagues know, his party won a majority of the seats in the Duma elections last year and stands to make significant gains in the elections in Russia this coming year.

For those who would argue that the threat from the former Soviet Union no longer exists, I would say take some time to read and update yourselves, whether it is through this particular book, which is a factual documentation, or perhaps the daily FIBUS reports which all of you have access to, which I read every day, on what is happening inside the former Soviet republics.

I take great pride in reaching out to the former Soviet Union. I cochair the energy caucus with the Russian Duma members, I cochair the environmental effort, and I work with them regularly.

But we have to understand, the military leadership in Russia today is the same military leadership that was there when it was the Soviet Union. They have not gone away. They have not run off and converted themselves. The generals in charge are the same generals who were in charge when it was a Communist state, and if you look at what is happening with the intelligence reports that we have access to as Members, they are planning on playing a major role in the upcoming Duma elections this December.

For those who say we can ignore all of this and that we can somehow put our heads in the sand and think that all is rosy, you are just not being hon-

est with yourself or with the American people, because that is not factually borne out by what is happening in that country. There is tremendous turmoil in Russia. There is turmoil in Ukraine.

We had the President of Belarus, just 1 month ago, say he was no longer going to allow the return of the SS-25 missiles. He said he is going to keep them on his own soil, because Russia was not giving enough money to assist in dismantling those missiles. Those are the same missiles, by the way, that have a range of 5,500 kilometers, that can hit any city in America.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here as an alarmist, but what I am asking our colleagues to do is to read factual information. If my colleagues would like to read the book on Zhirinovsky if they have the time, I will provide a copy to them. If they would like to read the FIBUS reports, I will summarize them for them. If you would like to meet with some of the 100 Duma members I met with this year, I will arrange for that. You can laugh all you want. We are talking about a serious issue.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that what we are doing here I think could really shortchange not just our military but the security of the free world. It might sound good to make a 10-percent cut in the intelligence budget. That is absolutely the wrong decision to be making on this bill, and I would encourage our colleagues to reject this amendment and support efforts to beef up our understanding of what is happening in the former Soviet republics.

□ 1645

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

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues who appeared just before, he raised a point which I think is very, very important. During much of this debate, people have been suggesting that the world has changed so radically because the East-West confrontation has disappeared and, therefore, we can just radically adjust our defense spending, but there is no need for intelligence spending as well.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this: Beginning with an important point to me, it is my privilege now serving on the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on the Subcommittee on National Security that is before us today. But I also serve with my chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security as a colleague on the Select Committee on Intelligence as well. To combine those two responsibilities gives one a much different picture of the world than I had preceding that service.

Mr. Chairman, there is little question that all of us are very hopeful about the future in terms of the prospects of peace for the world. The hopeful elimination of the East-West confrontation is encouraging to each and every one of

us who care about our future. Because of that, many in the House have automatically assumed that we can afford to lightly, almost radically readjust our defense spending.

As a result of that, as has been discussed, we have readjusted downward over the last several years in this Nation, causing us today to be spending \$100 billion less than we were before. To suggest that in light of that, that just lightly we can recalculate the need for intelligence spending, readjust similarly, or whack away at these programs would be the gravest of mistakes in terms of our responsibility, not just to this House, the people we represent, but also to those people we would have to preserve peace for in the world.

The intelligence community has come down, as has been discussed. Since 1990, the reductions have been close to 16 percent in this area. But let me say to my colleagues, further reduction could be a dramatic mistake on our part, for as we have reduced defense spending, we are dealing with the reality that the world is much more complex today, not less complex than when we were dealing directly, day in and day out, in our concerns about the Soviet Union.

Indeed, the world is complex not only in terms of Russia, but very, very complex in terms of those other countries we must deal with. And further complex by the fact that it is a much more dangerous world. Those who tended to set aside concerns about terrorism took a look again when bombs went off in New York. But even then, people lightly set that aside.

Oklahoma City came along and questions were raised one more time. Maybe we better know more about this complex world. I would submit to my colleagues and Members that this is exactly not the time to be reducing these budgets.

Indeed, the President, and I would speak to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle especially, our President at this time needs more and better information, not less information. To cut this valuable base from under him is going to undermine his ability to develop policy that is critical to the future of peace in the world. This is not the moment for us to presume that intelligence is unnecessary. Indeed, the intelligent decision is to be increasing these budgets at this moment instead.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just point out that we are not slashing Medicare. There is nothing about Medicare in this bill. And I can make this commitment to you, that in any legislation that this Congress brings forth to the House there will not be any slash in Medicare.

There is nothing in this bill about Head Start. There are a lot of things that were talked about during the de-

bate that are not in this bill. And the reason I make this point is that there are 13 different appropriations bills, many agencies of Government, each one of them having their own areas of responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, we do not do anybody a service by trying to play one against the other and say we cannot do this because we are going to do that. These are all important, but they are not all done in the same appropriations bill.

A lot of things that have been talked about are things that could be done by the State governments. And as my colleagues know, through our block grant program we plan to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has expired.

(On request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of activities that we are going to be funding through block grants and other types of programs, but a lot of those could be done by the States or the local governments.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that the cities or the counties or the States cannot do that must be done by the Federal Government it is to protect the security of this Nation. We are talking about a national defense. We are talking about an Army, a Navy, an Air Force, a Marine Corps, a Coast Guard, an intelligence community, and all of these related activities.

Those things can only be done by the Federal Government. The States cannot do them. So, we as the Federal Congress have an obligation. The Constitution gives us the obligation to provide for the common defense. That includes intelligence, knowing what is happening in the world which might affect us. Let us face it, almost everything that happens in the world affects the United States today because of the Nation that we are.

We cannot afford to put blinders on our eyes or to put plugs in our ears and not be able to determine what a potential threat might be or where it might be coming from.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot accept this amendment. It is just too massive a cut in a relatively small budget that is essential to providing for the protection of the security of our Nation and our interests, whatever they might be, and our people.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize our people, because intelligence not only deals with the spooky spy things that we hear about in the movies, but it deals with threats from terrorists. We deal with threats from narcotics dealers. We deal with threats from nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. We are dealing with providing intelligence on a lot of threats.

If we do not have that intelligence, we are blindfolded. We just cannot have this cut.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Florida for he has said it all. In this moment, in this very, very complex world, it is just the moment the President needs more and better information and the House needs that information too.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons we have been able to cut the defense budget by \$100 billion is because we are getting better and better intelligence. In the gulf war, for example, we were able to use precision-guided munitions and we were able to use the intelligence we had for targeting purposes, and we got a much higher kill rate than we ever got in any other war before.

As we move into the future, with the block 30 upgrade on the B-2, we will be able to fuse intelligence right into the cockpit and go after Scud missile launcher and other mobile targets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEWIS of California was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, in the totality of the defense budget, we are going to be able to come down a little further if we have quality intelligence. I just believe that a 10-percent cut on top of what we have done over the last 4 or 5 years is too severe and I urge that we defeat the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] makes a very important point. Indeed, it is my work on the Select Committee on Intelligence that has caused me to believe that we are right on the verge of peace in our time. There is a hope for peace in the world, because of some of the things that America is about. Our intelligence community is playing a very significant role in that connection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have heard a few things said on the floor, and I feel that if people would have served in the frontline, either in the intelligence agency or in the service of this country in the military, that their views might change because of the threat.

First of all, I heard that the cold war is over. Russia, the former Soviet Union, today has built and is producing an airplane called the Su-35. It is superior to our F-14's and even our F-15 Strike Eagles. That airplane carries an AA-10 missile superior to our AMRAAM. They are stealthing their

Baltic fleet. They are second in the world at accomplishing that.

Mr. Chairman, I look at Bosnia and the threat that we have there, the imminent threat of putting our troops; another reason why I did not want to lift the arms embargo. Saddam Hussein is still out there. The problems in Israel and North Korea.

The Bottom-Up Review was a level at which we were supposed to fight two conflicts simultaneously after our drawdown. Well, according to GAO, we are between \$150 to \$200 billion below the Bottom-Up Review, and this is the bare-bone minimum, after a drawdown.

Mr. Chairman, especially in a weakened state, and after the hearings and the testimony time and time again before our committee where they say we could go to war, but it would be a very short-lasting readiness level, that we definitely need more intelligence instead of less.

Second, this is at times, Mr. Chairman, a very evil place and I believe that. It is a place about power. It is a place about the ability to disperse money so that you can get reelected with interest groups. It is the ability to get reelected so that you can control the power and control the majority. And to do that, what we are actually trying to do in education and welfare and the other things are damaged.

Let me give you a couple of classic examples. We get a very low percentage of the dollars back down in the education because the Federal bureaucracy that eats it up here in Washington, DC, but I have heard people say we are cutting education. What we are doing is cutting the Federal bureaucracy.

We only get 23 cents of every dollar that we send here back to the classroom. Take a look at the State bureaucracy, which we have to limit as well. That is not helping education. Look across this country with the SAT scores and reading comprehension, the system has failed.

The gentleman from the other side has his right to a view of bigger government and bigger bureaucracy. I am not disputing his right to have that view. But in that view, it damages the national security of this country, and that I do dispute.

I look at welfare and a very failed system where we only get about 30 cents out of every buck down to it, but yet they will tell you that we are taking food out of mothers' mouths. And in the Medicare system where we are increasing it from \$4,800 to \$6,700, that is not a cut; that is an add.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going under the same assumptions that they do that we are going to allow the mismanagement, the \$16 billion in fraud, waste, and abuse and other things. The bottom line is that we are taking that power out of Washington and moving it back to the States. In the meantime, we are trying to protect this country and its national security needs. In a weakened state, we need to encourage

the increase in the intelligence community.

Right now, today, over Bosnia, we have an unmanned drone called the Predator. We are also using the Hunter. That information allows us to find those targets and lessen the risk to our pilots as they are flying over Bosnia today. Yet those systems under these cuts would probably go away. They are just hanging on with the limited funds we have available for national defense.

Can we afford to put our people's lives at risk when we are taking these kinds of cuts? When we are already \$200 billion below the Bottom-Up Review and the President of this country, in his first Budget Act, wanted to cut defense \$177 billion, after candidate Clinton himself said that \$50 billion would put us into a hollow force.

So, Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's right to have his view, but on the same term, I do not respect the ability that it would diminish the chance of our men and women coming back in combat.

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

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

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

□ 1700

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, now is not really the time to get into a debate over some of the issues that the gentleman from California and the chairman raised, but I would just say the following: We are one Government, and all of the money that we expend comes from the taxpayers, the American people.

The facts are very clear that the United States has, for example, the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrial world. Nobody disputes that. It is a national shame. In my view, the gentleman may disagree.

The facts are also clear that as a result of policy being made by the majority party, more and more children in this country will suffer and childhood poverty will increase. The United States today, in the United States today, millions of working-class families cannot afford to send their kids to college.

To my mind, there is no question but as a result of recent decisions made by the majority, it will be significantly harder for middle-class families to send their kids to college.

In my State of Vermont and in California and all over this country, millions of elderly people cannot afford the high cost of pharmaceutical drugs, and millions of senior citizens today cannot afford the high cost of health care, despite Medicare.

There is no dispute that as a result of cuts in Medicare, it will be harder and harder for the elderly people to pay for their health care needs, which are going up.

We are one people. If we expend more unnecessarily on intelligence budgets,

with the end of the cold war and the decline of the Soviet Union, there is simply less money available to be used on other domestic needs.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I oppose my friend's amendment, and I say we worked hard in trying to balance the intelligence-gathering effort in this country.

Over the years we saw that there was excessive spending, and we cut it dramatically a couple of years ago, against the advice of the President himself and the Director of the intelligence agency. But we think we made the right cuts, the threat had changed so dramatically.

We are continuing that trend to make sure it is leaner and does a better job with the changed threat.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Vermont in the fact that it would be inappropriate to bring up those issues if they had not been brought up by your side as saying that we were taking away from this bill. That is the reason I addressed them.

Secondly, as we have been only in power for a very short time as far as the majority, those kinds of things did not happen on our watch. Look at the welfare system as it has failed today. Look at the education system. We have good schools.

But as you take a look across the board, there is a lot of work we can do to help those things, and with the Intelligence Committee and with the drawdown of our defense forces, you cannot say the majority party is destroying these other things to beef up defense. Those systems are already in dire need of help. That is what we are trying to do by taking the power away from you and away from Washington and giving it back to the people.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me just urge the Members to vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, July 31, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] will be postponed.

The point of order of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. 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 Mrs. SCHROEDER: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 3 percent.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I stand to say I think this is a very, very important amendment and a chance to deal with the biggest threat America has, and that is the threat of the debt. Look, that is our biggest threat, and this is the first time I ever remember on this House floor that we have voted for more money for the Defense Department than the President asked for, who is commander in chief, than the Pentagon asked for, than the Joint Chiefs asked for.

All this amendment does is it is an across-the-board cut to bring that level back down to what the Pentagon, the President and the Joint Chiefs came across the river and said this is what is needed for the threat.

This is a total of a \$7.8 billion increase above the level that was requested by the Pentagon. Now, I just want to say that I think we really, if we are going to talk about fiscal responsibility, this is an area where we ought to do it.

Nobody has taken this floor during the entire debate and said that the threat is \$7.8 billion greater than the President viewed it, \$7.8 billion greater than the Joint Chiefs viewed it or whatever. No. We did not say that.

Instead, we voted to say we are going to add these different things on that they did not ask for, but it should be threat-related, especially when the biggest threat is the threat of the debt.

If you look at the defense budget after this cut would take effect, it would still be that we are allocating more money to defense in this country than the combined amounts of our NATO allies, Russia, and Japan, more than all of those.

If you look at the costs that I am sure we are going to hear about for some of the things that are going on in the Middle East and Somalia, the former Yugoslavia, places where we now have troops and where they are doing different things, be they humanitarian or otherwise, the estimates for all of those things are only about \$3 billion. So that is not driving this budget.

But what we are talking about here is \$244.12 billion. That is really an incredible amount of money, and I really think that kind of money should be going to offset the debt.

I am not quite sure what the status of the whole lockbox issue is, but my hope would be that this could be locked up for the deficit. But if it is not, it could be used for many other things, too.

We have heard many other things during this debate that people thought were very high priorities.

So think about it. All during the Cold War we never gave the Pentagon more than they asked for, for heaven's sakes, and here it is over. We are giving them more than they asked for and more than the rest of the world together is spending on defense. Go figure.

What will this amendment do? What will it cut out? Well, we will hear all sorts of people saying, oh, it could hurt this, it could hurt that. Let me tell you, it does not say what they have to cut out. This gives total discretion to the Pentagon to figure out where they would take that 3 percent out.

They may decide they now want these new weapons they did not used to want, so they could cut other things. Let me give you some examples of places where folks say we could cut. If you look at just intelligence, we have the CIA, we have the Defense Intelligence Agency, we have the Navy Intelligence Agency, Air Force Intelligence Agency, Army Intelligence Agency, National Security Agency, and CIA. If you took all of those, we are told you could save \$19 billion in just overhead by trying to just combine them, as we see corporate America doing, and other such things, that there is a tremendous amount of overhead.

If you look at other places in the budget, there are all sorts of other places you could save in overhead. I think it has always been very interesting to me that each branch of the services has their own chaplain school. You know, is there a different way to be a Navy chaplain than there is to be an Army chaplain? I do not really think so. The same with law schools, the same with all sorts of things. So there are lots of ways that, if the Defense Department decides they now want to keep the B-2's in, they now want to keep other things in they had not asked for that we have put in, if they decide they want to do that, fine.

There are many other ways they can juggle these numbers. This is a 3 percent cut to bring it back to what they originally asked for, and I keep reminding you throughout this whole debate, no one heard one person say the threat is greater than they said, the amount is not enough.

Please, vote "aye" for this 3-percent cut.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended an appropriation of \$244.12 billion for DOD programs. This appropriation level represents a \$7.8 billion increase over the amount requested by the Pentagon. We don't need this spending increase because:

1) Our defense spending currently amounts to more than that of our NATO allies, Russia, and Japan combined.

2) We are still spending 92 cents for every dollar we spend during the cold war, and the cold war is over.

3) The actual extra cost of assorted contingency operations in Somalia, the Middle East, Africa, the former Yugoslavia, and elsewhere totals approximately \$3 billion per year—1% of current military spending.

Your amendment reduces the funding level appropriated for DOD programs by 3% to conform to the level requested by the administration. We have better things that we could do with \$8 billion. For example, we could:

First, return it to the Treasury for deficit reduction.

Second, increase funding for biomedical research at NIH by 75%.

Third, clean up 312 superfund sites, average clean up costs per superfund site is \$25 million,

Fourth, block grant \$156 million to each of the 50 states.

Fifth, pay for more than 70 million mammograms.

Sixth, cover childcare costs for 2 million children for 1 year.

Seventh, send 1.3 million children to Headstart for 1 year.

Eighth, disperse Pell grants to 3.3 million needy students.

Ninth, put 235,493 new police officers on the street.

Tenth, offer prenatal and post-partum care to 2 million uninsured pregnant women.

Eleventh, provide 55 million school lunches to eligible children.

Twelfth, feed 9.5 million people one nutritious meal daily for one year.

Thirteenth, nearly quadruple our investment in women's health at HHS.

The increase = Pork for Hawks

If our financial situation is so dire that we must cut education, housing, and children's programs, then this increase in defense spending is irresponsible. If we're trying to balance the budget then why choose to spend:

\*\$974 million for a new, unrequested Amphibious Marine Transport

\*\$160 million for 8 unrequested AV-8 Harriers

\*\$140 million for 20 unrequested Kiowa Warrior Helicopters. This is \$20 million over the authorized amount.

\*\$40 million for 750 unrequested Hellfire missiles

\*\$39 million for 453 unrequested Javelin missiles

\*\$27.4 million for unrequested TOW2 System summary

\*\$46.1 million for 2100 unrequested MLRS Rockets

\*\$40 million for 45 unrequested Harpoon missiles

\*\$493 million, in unrequested funds, for the B-2 Bomber program

\*\$250 million for 6 unrequested F-15E Fighters

\*\$339 million for 10 unrequested C-130 Cargo Planes. This is \$48.6 million and 2 planes over the authorized amount.

\*\$599 million more for Ballistic Missile Defense

\*\$200 million more for F-22 Fighters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Before recognizing the next speaker, the Chair would like to inform the House that the 5 hours provided under the unanimous-consent agreement for the consideration of amendments expires at 5:27. At that time, wherever we are on whichever amendment we are on, the debate will cease and the Chair will put the question.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the way the amendment is written, each amount provided by this act is hereby reduced by 3 percent. In other words, every account in here, other than the mandatories, would be reduced by 3 percent. That is what the language says.

The problem here is that a large portion of that, almost two-thirds of that reduction, would come from operation and maintenance and military personnel.

Let me tell you what we would be cutting out of military personnel: the pay raise. Do not the people that serve in the military deserve a pay raise?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that it does not come out of the pay raise. It does not come out of anything in particular. It really is giving the Pentagon a line-item veto. They can allocate this 3 percent however they would like to.

It is a 3 percent across the board or a 3 percent cut of different areas, if you want to do it in personnel. I was pointing out all the ways you could combine things, just in intelligence agencies alone, to save \$19 billion, and that will come under personnel by combining them.

I really respect the gentleman from Florida, and I hope we do not get into trying to see a bogeyman here.

The President had in his budget a pay raise. We are all for a pay raise. We want that to happen.

But this is a budget that has more money than they asked for, and this is just to bring it back down to those numbers.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 2 minutes be added to my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, that may be the argument of the gentlewoman. That is not the way the amendment reads, and we have to go by the way the amendment is offered before the House.

"Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this act is hereby reduced by 3 percent." That means you go through the bill, pick out the items that are not mandatory, that are not entitlements, and they will be reduced by 3 percent.

All of the debate will not change that, and I say again that part of those accounts are O&M and personnel. \$4.5 billion of this reduction would be applied to those two accounts. That is where the pay raise comes from.

What else comes from that? Barracks. We have heard all year long about the sad condition of so many of our barracks. Pentagon officials who testified told us if you drive your kids up to college and their dormitories looked like these barracks, you would

put them in the car, take them home; you would not let them stay. That is not fair that your military personnel have to live in facilities like that.

During the break I had a chance to visit some of the military bases, and I have seen some of the barracks that go back to World War II. The tiles are falling off the ceiling. The pipes are leaking. The money is not there to either rebuild them or refurbish them.

So they are in poor condition, and they need to be corrected.

What about promotions? This would, in effect, stall a lot of promotions that are already scheduled. The members of the military are already starting to spend the money in their mind. Some of the promotions are not going to be able to go forward.

As we put this bill together, we did not add a lot of new money for procurement. We did not start up any nice, new, big programs. But what we did, we looked at all of the services, and we tried to isolate and identify those areas where there were real shortages of items that we have to have, and what called this to my attention was that at one of our earlier hearings this year we were talking about airplanes and buying new airplanes, and the witness who was testifying told us, "We are not so much worried about the airplanes. We are short of tugs to draw the airplanes from the hangars out to the runway," and it got me thinking, I wonder how many items there are out there like that that nobody has ever heard about that could actually stop the operation of our military forces.

So I assigned the staff of the subcommittee to identify for me items that nobody has ever heard about but that are essential and important to the conduct of our military forces, and with the help of this page I am going to unravel this long list of items you have never read about in the newspaper, you have never heard about on television, because they are not politically sexy, but they are things that are essential to maintaining our military.

□ 1715

Now here is where we added money, and, if we have to take a 3-percent reduction, we are going to lose a lot of this, things like trucks. I visited one Army facility. They had trucks that go back to Harry Truman's Presidency.

We have added additional money in this bill to buy some new trucks to replace those old trucks that cost more to maintain than to try to use them.

What were some of the other shortfalls?

Believe it or not, ammunition, shortfalls in ammunition. We are correcting that. We are adding additional money to buy ammunition.

What about rifles? Who would ever think that the U.S. Army would be short on rifles? But we are. Certain types of rifles the U.S. Army has a shortage.

Look at the testimony the Army testified today. Real property maintenance,

depot maintenance; those are the kind of things we put in this bill.

As I said, we did not create a lot of new programs, we did not start any massive new procurement programs or weapon systems. We are trying to enhance those that we have; we are trying to take care of the nuts and bolts to keep the machinery working.

Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of a statement that my grandmother taught me many, many years ago, and I have later learned that she was not the author, but she related it to me, and that was for the want of a nail the shoe was lost, and for want of the shoe the horse was lost, and for want of the horse the rider was lost, and it goes on to tell how the battle was lost. Well, this list I have just unrolled here, these are my horseshoe nails. We want to make sure we did not lose anything important because we did not provide for the horseshoe nail.

This 3-percent across-the-board cut is going to cut into the increases that we made in some of those nonsexy, non-political, but important, issues relative to those who serve in the Armed Forces, and again, Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman would argue that her amendment does not do that, but in fact it is exactly what it does.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to note in response to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], that I think it is about the third time I have seen him roll out that sheet, the so-called shortages, and all I would say is that I have in my hand this, what someone else from Wisconsin used to say is a copy of a report from the General Accounting Office. It is not very old, August 1995, is labeled "Defense Inventory," and the cover sheet says shortages are recurring but not a problem. The essence of the GAO report is simply that the accounting system of DOD grossly overstates shortage problems, and I would suggest that, therefore, we ought to take his concerns with a grain of salt when evaluating the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Now I ordinarily do not like across-the-board cuts. I think they are a brainless way to reduce expenditures and that we ought to have the courage to single out individual items of low priority before being excised from the budget in order to meet our responsibilities to reduce the deficit. But this House has demonstrated on every occasion today that it is not willing to make reductions in this bill in the intelligent way, and so I think that it leaves us with only one choice if we want to see a reduction, and that is to do it in the manner suggested by the gentlewoman from Colorado. I regret that, but I think the responsibility for the viability of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado lies with the committee for refusing to support amendments such as limiting the B-2 purchase to the number requested by

the Pentagon or heeding the General Accounting Office when it says that we should not be spending \$70 billion 7 years early on the F-22.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to go after specific nonessential programs and have not found a willingness on the part of the House to accommodate that, and so, if we are interested in seeing to it that this agency is not exempted from the budget squeeze which has been applied with great tenacity and sometimes with great viciousness to other programs in Government, we have no choice but to pursue this admittedly second- or even third-choice approach, but certainly being a better approach than no approach at all, and so I am going to reluctantly support the amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his support, and I agree with the gentleman. I do not like doing an across-the-board cut either, but I agree also that when we are squeezing out of everybody the very last, last drop of blood in other programs because of this debt that is looming over our head that we are all watching, I think it looks unconscionable to add more money to all of these things without coming up with a threat analysis that really drives it, and I think it is also very difficult to explain to the people why spending more money than all the rest of the world is spending on defense is still not enough.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to add more, and so I really hope that this body thinks about this. I realize there is always a wish list, there is always a wish list. I have never, never, never found an agency that did not have a wish list, and, if we said to them, Is there anything you need or are short of, they are a fool if they do not come forward with a long list. It is the same with my kids; it is the same with everyone I know. It is human nature.

But the issue is when the Joint Chiefs think it is adequate, and everyone else, then I think that the gentleman is making a good point. I am sorry to do an across-the-board. It is all I know how to do, but I think the American people would say we do not have sacred cows in this budget, and, if we do not pass this, we have got a 2-ton sacred cow grazing in this budget that has been held harmless.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply say I agree with that, and I would again point to the chart that I used on two other occasions today. The red bars on this chart show what has happened to the Russian military budget since 1989. The blue lines show what has happened to the American military budget since 1989.

Mr. Chairman, we had almost a 70-percent reduction in the Russian budget, very small reduction in ours. I think that indicates there is ample

room for the amendment of the gentleman to be accepted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] will be recognized for 3 minutes because the time for consideration of amendments expires at 5:27, and it is presently 5:24.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me, and I want to make this one last point:

This bill appropriates \$2.2 billion less than this House authorized on the defense authorization bill earlier this summer, \$2.2 billion less.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I would just like to say I cannot believe the discussion here. I would like for our colleagues to tell the 1 million men and women in this country who lost their jobs in the defense industry over the past 2 years that there are no cuts being made. I would like my colleagues to tell them what they have said on the floor today, that we have not been tough with defense spending.

And where do we get this dollar amount from? We are giving the President all this new money. I was President Clinton's bottom-up review who laid out the scenario for how much money we are going to need over the next 5 years.

We have heard the chairman of the full committee mention the General Accounting Office. It was the General Accounting Office who said that we are \$150 billion short just to meet the President's bottom-up review, and the Congressional Budget Office said we are at least \$60 billion short, and we are only increasing it by a very small amount. In fact, all we are doing is stabilizing defense spending.

I would urge our colleagues to reject this amendment and to support this very tough defense budget that I think has been crafted very wisely by the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Let me just say there is \$12 billion in backlog of real property maintenance. There is a backlog in depot maintenance. We have put it off for years. The military has put it off for what they think are other priorities.

The across-the-board cut is the worst kind of a cut available to the Members. The cuts were offered individually. The Members did not accept those cuts. Some amendments were accepted, some were not, but the point is an across-the-board cut is not the way to

cut defense. We have accepted across-the-board cuts, and I would strongly object to and ask the Members to vote against a 3-percent cut across the board.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming what little time I have left, the gentleman says that pay raises would not be affected, but, if it is an across-the-board, there is one that we have bipartisan support in trying to fix back the High-One problem that we have. In that account we either affect the COLA, Elk Hills, or High One. Which will it be? If we do a 3-percent cut, we either are going to cut the COLA of military retirees or we are going to affect those few people that have decided to get out recently.

I take a look at what our problems are right now across. We have got ships that are not being repaired.

The gentleman in support of the base closures, we cannot give the dollars for the base closures to reap the benefit of the dollars back to DOD, because we do not have the dollars. That would be hurt.

I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Schroeder amendment for a 3 percent cut in this defense appropriations bill. I want to talk about budget priorities. I want to remind my colleagues that this Congress really only has power over discretionary spending. That is about 54 percent of the budget, and that 54 percent is divided equally, 50-50, between military and nonmilitary spending.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard all this talk about how we are going to cut waste in this new Congress. We are going to balance the budget. But we may be surprised to hear that all of the cuts, all of them, I repeat, all the cuts, have come from nonmilitary spending. Did the military budget get a cut? No, it did not. In fact, it got a huge increase.

Now, poll after poll shows that the average American wants Pentagon spending either kept the same or cut, but they do not want it increased. In this bill before us today, national missile defense—the true star wars—is actually increased 111 percent over last year's level. And one theater missile defense program—Navy upper tier—is increased almost 300 percent over last year. Mr. Chairman, I think this is wrong and I would submit that the American people might think this is a wrong use of their money.

Now, it is true that we have made enormous cuts. But I would like to talk about what those cuts are, and keeping in mind that those cuts are at the same time we are increasing Pentagon spending, while some of the cuts have been direct attacks on our children and our country's future.

The Republicans have approved cuts that would deny Head Start to 180,000 children nationwide by the year 2002. In addition, Pell Grants are being cut. Pell Grants help our young people get to college and they will be denied to 360,000 students in 1996. In fact, 3,000 students in Oregon will not have a chance to go to college because of these cuts.

They are also attacking the environment. Let me tell you some of the cuts in the environment. All funding is eliminated for listing of threatened and endangered species. These

are species on which the fishing industry depends. We need support for these endangered species, but we are cutting all the funding. There is a 40-percent reduction in solar and renewable energy, a 33-percent reduction in the EPA budget, including a \$765 million cut in clean water funding. There is a 17-percent cut in all of the EPA enforcement.

And what about cuts to seniors? We have cut \$270 billion in Medicare and eliminated the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. This new Congress has cut senior nutrition programs by \$24 million. The older workers' programs—\$46 million in cuts. All at the same time that we are increasing the Pentagon, we are cutting from children, from the environment, and from seniors.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if cutting away at these programs is the right priority. Is it the priority that we believe in in this country to cut away at security protections, the security of good education, safer streets, healthy children, and seniors, a safe and healthy environment? I would say it is the wrong priority.

Shame—I think it is a shame—when we have such very skewed economics priorities. I would say that they are not the priorities of my constituents. Voting for the Schroeder amendment will go a little way toward righting those priorities.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for consideration of amendments has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, July 31, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be postponed.

The Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

"This Act may be cited as the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996".

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, July 31, 1995, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 9 offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]; amendment No. 43 offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 93, noes 325, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 643]

AYES—93

Baldacci	Green	Peterson (MN)
Barcia	Gutierrez	Petri
Barrett (WI)	Gutknecht	Poshard
Becerra	Hilliard	Rangel
Bonior	Hinchev	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Camp	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Klecza	Royce
Clayton	LaFalce	Rush
Coble	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Lincoln	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Lofgren	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Luther	Shays
Cooley	Markey	Slaughter
Costello	Martinez	Stark
Coyne	McCarthy	Studds
Danner	McDermott	Stupak
DeFazio	Meehan	Thompson
Dellums	Meyers	Torricelli
Duncan	Miller (CA)	Traficant
Durbin	Minge	Velazquez
Eshoo	Mink	Vento
Evans	Nadler	Volkmer
Fattah	Neal	Waters
Fields (LA)	Oberstar	Watt (NC)
Filner	Obey	Williams
Foglietta	Olver	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Owens	Wyden
Furse	Pastor	Yates
Goodlatte	Payne (NJ)	Zimmer

NOES—325

Abercrombie	Chenoweth	Fowler
Ackerman	Christensen	Fox
Allard	Chryslers	Franks (CT)
Andrews	Clement	Franks (NJ)
Archer	Clinger	Frelinghuysen
Army	Clyburn	Frisa
Bachus	Coburn	Frost
Baessler	Coleman	Funderburk
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Galleghy
Baker (LA)	Combest	Ganske
Ballenger	Condit	Gejdenson
Barr	Cox	Gekas
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Geren
Bartlett	Crane	Gibbons
Barton	Crapo	Gilchrist
Bass	Creameans	Gillmor
Bateman	Cubin	Gilman
Beilenson	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bentsen	Davis	Goodling
Bereuter	de la Garza	Gordon
Berman	Deal	Goss
Bevill	DeLay	Graham
Bilbray	Deutsch	Greenwood
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Bliley	Dickey	Hall (OH)
Blute	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Boehlert	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Boehner	Doggett	Hamilton
Bonilla	Dooley	Hancock
Bono	Doolittle	Hansen
Borski	Dornan	Harman
Boucher	Doyle	Hastert
Brewster	Dreier	Hastings (FL)
Browder	Dunn	Hastings (WA)
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hayes
Brownback	Ehlers	Hayworth
Bryant (TN)	Ehrlich	Hefley
Bryant (TX)	Emerson	Hefner
Bunn	Engel	Heineman
Bunning	English	Herger
Burr	Ensign	Hilleary
Burton	Everett	Hobson
Buyer	Ewing	Hoekstra
Callahan	Farr	Hoke
Calvert	Fawell	Holden
Canady	Fields (TX)	Horn
Cardin	Flake	Hostettler
Castle	Flanagan	Houghton
Chabot	Foley	Hoyer
Chambless	Forbes	Hunter
Chapman	Ford	Hutchinson
		Hyde

Inglis	Metcalf	Seastrand
Istook	Mfume	Shadegg
Jackson-Lee	Mica	Shaw
Jacobs	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Jefferson	Mineta	Skaggs
Johnson (CT)	Molinari	Skeen
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan	Skelton
Johnson, Sam	Montgomery	Smith (MI)
Johnston	Moorhead	Smith (NJ)
Jones	Moran	Smith (TX)
Kaptur	Murtha	Smith (WA)
Kasich	Myers	Solomon
Kelly	Myrick	Souder
Kennedy (RI)	Nethercutt	Spence
Kennelly	Neumann	Spratt
Kildee	Ney	Stearns
Kim	Norwood	Stenholm
King	Nussle	Stockman
Kingston	Ortiz	Stokes
Klink	Orton	Stump
Klug	Oxley	Talent
Knollenberg	Packard	Talent
Kolbe	Pallone	Tanner
LaHood	Parker	Tate
Lantos	Paxon	Tauzin
Largent	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Latham	Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
LaTourette	Peterson (FL)	Tejeda
Laughlin	Pickett	Thomas
Lazio	Pombo	Thornberry
Leach	Pomeroy	Thornton
Levin	Porter	Thurman
Lewis (CA)	Portman	Tiahrt
Lewis (KY)	Pryce	Torkildsen
Lightfoot	Quillen	Torres
Linder	Quinn	Upton
Lipinski	Radanovich	Visclosky
Livingston	Rahall	Vucanovich
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Walker
Longley	Reed	Walsh
Lowey	Regula	Wamp
Lucas	Richardson	Ward
Manton	Riggs	Watts (OK)
Manzullo	Rogers	Waxman
Martini	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (FL)
Mascara	Rose	Weldon (PA)
Matsui	Roth	Weller
McCollum	Roukema	White
McCrery	Sabo	Whitfield
McDade	Salmon	Wicker
McHale	Sanford	Wilson
McHugh	Sawyer	Wise
McInnis	Saxton	Wolf
McIntosh	Scarborough	Wynn
McKeon	Schaefer	Young (AK)
McNulty	Schiff	Young (FL)
Meek	Schumer	Zeliff
Menendez	Scott	

NOT VOTING—16

Bishop	McKinney	Sisisky
DeLauro	Moakley	Towns
Dingell	Morella	Tucker
Fazio	Reynolds	Waldholtz
Gephardt	Roberts	
Maloney	Serrano	

□ 1753

Mr. DOOLEY and Mr. MFUME changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, on amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. SANDERS, rollcall No. 643, I inadvertently voted "yes." I intended to vote "no" on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that this statement immediately follow the rollcall on this amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 124, noes 296, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 644]

AYES—124

Ackerman	Hoekstra	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Jackson-Lee	Payne (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Jacobs	Pelosi
Becerra	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Johnson (SD)	Porter
Bentsen	Johnson	Poshard
Berman	Kennedy (MA)	Ramstad
Bonior	Kildee	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Kleczka	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Klug	Roukema
Bryant (TX)	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Lantos	Sanders
Clayton	Levin	Sanford
Clement	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	Lincoln	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Lipinski	Schumer
Conyers	Lofgren	Shays
Coyne	Lowe	Skaggs
Danner	Luther	Slaughter
DeFazio	Manton	Stark
Dellums	Markey	Stokes
Deutsch	Martinez	Studds
Doggett	Matsui	Stupak
Duncan	McCarthy	Thornton
Durbin	McDermott	Thurman
Engel	Meehan	Torres
English	Meek	Torricelli
Eshoo	Menendez	Upton
Evans	Mfume	Velazquez
Farr	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fattah	Mineta	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Minge	Waters
Filner	Mink	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Nadler	Waxman
Ford	Neal	Williams
Frank (MA)	Ney	Woolsey
Furse	Oberstar	Wyden
Gibbons	Obey	Wynn
Green	Olver	Yates
Gutierrez	Owens	Zimmer
Hilliard	Pallone	
Hinche	Pastor	

NOES—296

Abercrombie	Bunning	Deal
Allard	Burr	DeLauro
Andrews	Burton	DeLay
Archer	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Armey	Callahan	Dickey
Bachus	Calvert	Dicks
Baesler	Camp	Dixon
Baker (CA)	Canady	Dooley
Baker (LA)	Cardin	Doolittle
Baldacci	Castle	Dorman
Ballenger	Chabot	Doyle
Barr	Chambliss	Dreier
Barrett (NE)	Chapman	Dunn
Bartlett	Chenoweth	Edwards
Barton	Christensen	Ehlers
Bass	Chrysler	Ehrlich
Bateman	Clinger	Emerson
Bereuter	Clyburn	Ensign
Beverly	Coble	Everett
Bilbray	Coburn	Ewing
Bilirakis	Coleman	Fawell
Bliley	Collins (GA)	Fazio
Blute	Combest	Fields (TX)
Boehrlert	Condit	Flake
Boehner	Cooley	Flanagan
Bonilla	Costello	Foley
Bono	Cox	Forbes
Borski	Cramer	Fowler
Boucher	Crane	Fox
Brewster	Crapo	Franks (CT)
Browder	Creameans	Franks (NJ)
Brown (FL)	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Brownback	Cunningham	Frisa
Bryant (TN)	Davis	Frost
Bunn	de la Garza	Funderburk

Gallegly	Laughlin	Rose
Ganske	Lazio	Roth
Gejdenson	Leach	Royce
Gekas	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Geran	Lewis (KY)	Sabo
Gilchrest	Lightfoot	Salmon
Gillmor	Linder	Saxton
Gilman	Livingston	Scarborough
Gonzalez	LoBiondo	Schaefer
Goodlatte	Longley	Schiff
Goodling	Lucas	Scott
Gordon	Manzullo	Seastrand
Goss	Martini	Sensenbrenner
Graham	Mascara	Serrano
Greenwood	McCollum	Shadegg
Gunderson	McCrery	Shaw
Gutknecht	McDade	Shuster
Hall (OH)	McHale	Skeen
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Skelton
Hamilton	McInnis	Smith (MI)
Hancock	McIntosh	Smith (NJ)
Hansen	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Harman	McNulty	Smith (WA)
Hastert	Metcalfe	Solomon
Hastings (FL)	Meyers	Souder
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Spence
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Spratt
Hayworth	Molinaro	Stearns
Hefley	Mollohan	Stenholm
Hefner	Montgomery	Stockman
Heineman	Moorhead	Stump
Herger	Moran	Talent
Hilleary	Murtha	Tanner
Hobson	Myers	Tate
Hoke	Myrick	Tauzin
Holden	Nethercutt	Taylor (MS)
Horn	Neumann	Taylor (NC)
Hostettler	Norwood	Tejeda
Houghton	Nussle	Thomas
Hoyer	Ortiz	Thompson
Hunter	Orton	Thornberry
Hutchinson	Oxley	Tiahrt
Hyde	Packard	Torkildsen
Inglis	Parker	Traficant
Istook	Paxon	Visclosky
Jefferson	Peterson (FL)	Vucanovich
Johnson, E. B.	Petri	Walker
Johnson, Sam	Pickett	Walsh
Jones	Pombo	Wamp
Kanjorski	Pomeroy	Ward
Kasich	Portman	Watts (OK)
Kelly	Pryce	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (RI)	Quillen	Weldon (PA)
Kennelly	Quinn	Weller
Kim	Radanovich	White
King	Rahall	Whitfield
Kingston	Reed	Wicker
Klink	Regula	Wilson
Knollenberg	Richardson	Wise
Kolbe	Riggs	Wolf
LaHood	Roemer	Young (AK)
Largent	Rogers	Young (FL)
Latham	Rohrabacher	Zeliff
LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop	McKinney	Siskis
Dingell	Moakley	Towns
Gephardt	Morella	Tucker
Kaptur	Reynolds	Waldholtz
Maloney	Roberts	

□ 1801

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 demonstrates misguided priorities of the new majority in the House. At the same time that billions of dollars are slated to be slashed from education, environmental protection, housing assistance, job training and other needed family programs, the Republican leadership brings to the floor a Defense appropriations bill that spends nearly 8 billion dollars more than the Pentagon requested for the coming year 1996.

In fact, the Defense appropriations bill not only includes billions in extra Pentagon funding, it adds money for weapons and programs that top Defense officials have stated they do not want or need. For example, the bill in-

cludes nearly half a billion dollars to continue production of the B-2 stealth bomber beyond the 20 planes that have already been authorized. That's a half a billion dollars for a plane that appears to have significant technical problems, not the least of which is its inability to distinguish rain from other solid obstacles like mountains! The B-2 is a budget busting boondoggle that I hoped my colleagues would have rejected by supporting the Kasich-Dellums-Obey amendment to eliminate funding for additional Stealth bombers from the bill.

This legislation includes \$3.5 billion for ballistic missile defense—\$599 million more than the budget request—and it shifts the priority toward national missile defense, the star wars program which invites violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty. The bill provides \$200 million more than the budget request for the F-22 fighter and an extra \$250 million for the F-15. A wide range of humanitarian, peacekeeping, environmental, and disaster relief programs have been sacrificed in order to pay for these added weapons procurement costs. In addition, the bill eliminates the Technology Reinvestment Project and underfunds the Nunn-Lugar denuclearization program in the former Soviet Union. Time and again, this bill serves narrow special interests over the interests of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we face many difficult choices this year, but the decision to oppose the Defense Appropriations bill is not one of them. This legislation turns our national priorities upside down—spending billions on star wars missile defense programs and stealth bombers the Pentagon doesn't want at the same time that education, Medicare, housing, and environmental protection programs are being decimated. We need to get our priorities in order. I urge a no vote on the Defense appropriations bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2126, the Defense Appropriations Act of 1995. While I am aware of the current fashion in the Congress to increase defense spending at the expense of our domestic programs, I am also mindful of my duty as a Member of Congress to act in the best interest of the people I represent and in the best interest of the U.S. Constitution I have sworn to uphold. This shortsighted and rushed legislation will not only try to resurrect cold war programs that are unnecessary and wasteful, but will endanger the delicate balance of domestic and defense spending.

The National Defense Authorization Act of 1995 that we are considering here today is completely out of balance. This legislation authorizes \$7.8 billion more in funding than requested by the administration and \$2.5 billion more than current spending levels. H.R. 2126 seeks to isolate the United States by restricting America's role in peacekeeping operations, and misguidedly redirects \$3.5 billion to a star wars missile defense system whose time passed with the end of the cold war. This bill also appropriates \$493 million more than requested by the military for the B-2 Stealth bomber. H.R. 2126 impinges on the President's constitutional authority by eliminating \$65 million requested by the administration for United Nations peacekeeping, and \$180 million less than requested for aid to the former Soviet Union.

It would be an abdication of congressional responsibility to support this legislation at the

expense of our most important efforts to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that our military is by far among the world's best. This was demonstrated by our leadership of international forces during the war in the gulf. Over the past 20 years, our military has undergone a massive undertaking to build a defense infrastructure which has allowed us to effectively provide an international show of strength.

While I believe that we must maintain a strong military presence in an era of low intensity global conflicts, I am an avid believer that a healthy balance must be reached between domestic and defense spending. The importance of striking this balance is especially true in light of recent world events such as the end of the cold war. Because of these changes in world politics, the United States is faced with an unprecedented opportunity to redirect funds to relieve problems here at home.

Contrary to the arguments that have been made by the supporters of H.R. 2126, President Clinton has proposed a budget that reasonably addresses the defense and domestic needs of this Nation. President Clinton's fiscal year 1996 defense budget, which is strongly supported by the Pentagon, has two key initiatives: enhancement of military readiness, and improvement of quality of life for our men and women in uniform and their families.

The ironic truth about H.R. 2126 is that it will actually weaken our national defense. The bill before us today appropriates a staggering \$3.5 billion for an unnecessary star wars ballistic missile defense system. Because of this massive diversion of defense dollars to a star wars missile defense system, more legitimate funding goals outlined in the President's budget will be undermined. This provision of the bill will also result in a clear violation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been in favor of a balanced approach to our domestic and foreign affairs interests, and the Constitution's separation of powers. H.R. 2126 is out of balance and undermines the presidential power to shape our foreign policy. This legislation greatly restricts the United States ability to participate in United Nations multilateral peacekeeping operations. This congressional restriction of presidential authority is contrary to the principle of separation of powers and the clear language of the Constitution. The Constitution permits the President as Commander in Chief of the U.S. Armed Forces the power to place U.S. forces under the operational control of other nations' military leaders for United Nations operations.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for me to point out that under the current congressional leadership, U.S. policy has taken a direction that will adversely affect the essence of each and every one of our lives. The majority party's plan ignores quality of human life questions, and in order to finance additional military spending, we have been expected time and time again to sacrifice already substantially depleted health, housing, education, and employment budgets.

As opposed to spending billions of dollars to immunize American children, revitalize our urban centers, provide jobs to the jobless or homes for the homeless, this bill seeks to divert funds from these essential services to fund star wars and other unworkable initiatives. H.R. 2126 is an essential part of the Republican strategy to force through a series of

ills that will gut the chances for many Americans to live the American dream.

A review of the Republican plan to slash domestic discretionary programs reveal that many programs serving the most needy will be cut. One need only review the VA-HUD and Labor HHS appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 to see that it cuts education programs by 17 percent, Head Start by 4 percent, the Environmental Protection Agency by 32 percent, and housing for the poor by 26 percent. This mis-direction of funds would greatly harm the American people, the strength of our Nation's defense and the future of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say that while the pursuit of peace is a noble and necessary objective, it is no easy task—especially when certain Members of Congress are determined to promote antiquated notions left over from the cold war. This legislation clearly reflects the new majority's desire to sacrifice the domestic interests of the American people in pursuit of isolationism and star wars. I urge my colleagues to uphold our Constitution, protect the American people, and vote down this bill.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased that Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member MURTHA accepted my amendment reducing the account initial spares and repair parts by \$22 million.

This was a very reasonable reduction. In its fiscal year 1996 request, the Department of Defense asked for \$118 million for spare parts. Since then, the Air Force has told us that the requirement for 120 C-17's is only \$96 million—a difference of \$22 million.

The Milestone III Defense Acquisition Board [DAB] Integrated Airlift Force Decision is planned for this November. Ever since the Deputy Secretary of Defense put the C-17 program on probation in late 1993, the Air Force has consistently told us that this DAB decision will choose a number of C-17's somewhere between 40 and 120.

Giving the Air Force money for C-17 spares and repair parts for a number of planes beyond 120 would be a waste of money. DOD has higher priorities, and certainly the American taxpayers do. Frankly, in a program that's experienced as many problems as the C-17 has, I wasn't surprised to find additional waste such as this.

I would prefer that we only provide funding for spare parts for 40 C-17's at this time. Buying spares now for 120 C-17's prejudices the DAB decision. I have refrained from prejudging the DAB in my amendments to both the defense authorization and the defense appropriation and I believe it would be a more responsible approach if the C-17's supporters do so as well.

If the November DAB decision is for fewer than 120 C-17's and I fully expect it to be, I would expect the level of funding in this spare parts account to be reduced commensurately.

My \$22 million cut that was adopted by the House is also included in the defense authorization approved by the Senate earlier this week. I will work to ensure it remains in both the defense authorization and appropriation conference bills.

The American taxpayers have already spent almost \$18 billion on the C-17 and only 21 have been delivered. The plane was designed to meet a cold war threat that no longer exists and to accommodate battle plans that have since changed. The C-17 is designed to land

on short runways. However, short runways are frequently not thick enough to support the plane since its weight is distributed on too few tires. This fundamental flaw was evident in the recently completed reliability, maintainability, and availability evaluation when one runway that was chosen for use during this test had to be rejected because of the damage to the surface that would have been caused.

It is time to cut our losses and admit that the C-17 is simply too expensive. Taxpayers would be interested to know that if we were to buy planes we already know how to build such as 747's or C-5's instead of C-17's, we would get more airlift sooner and save \$15 billion. A recent Wall Street Journal analysis gave this four-word assessment of 747's compared to other transport planes: "Highest capacity, lowest price."

I believe that soon we will be forced to bow to economic reality and stop buying this gold-plated cold war relic. In the meantime, my amendment prevents us from throwing money at the plane that cannot be used, even in scenarios proposed by its most optimistic cheerleaders.

I appreciate the foresight, leadership, and cooperation of the leadership of the Appropriations National Security Subcommittee in working with me to make this needed cut of \$22 million.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit the following B-2 proclamation for the RECORD.

#### B-2 PROCLAMATION—JULY 26, 1996

Whereas, we the National Aerospace and Defense Workforce Coalition recognize that the present and future of America's aerospace and defense industrial base depends on public and private investment in new technologies, as well as education and training programs geared toward the jobs of tomorrow;

Whereas, the aerospace industry has provided American workers with economic and social mobility and whose income has added to this country's tax base;

Whereas, growth in our nation's technological capabilities rests on ensuring a sufficient and stable defense budget, as well as an industrial climate that promotes a healthy aerospace and defense industry;

Whereas, a declining defense budget has undermined our industrial base as well as our manufacturing infrastructure;

Whereas, America still maintains superiority in stealth technology that is so essential in preserving our national security;

Whereas, the National Aerospace and Defense Workforce Coalition is tired of public policy makers apologizing for supporting programs that provide American jobs while protecting our industrial base and providing for the common defense;

Therefore, be it resolved that the preservation of America's economic and national security ultimately rests on our commitment to maintaining an industrial base in the stealth arena. America cannot afford to lose the unique B-2 stealth production team. A low rate of continued production of this aircraft is definitely in the national interest.

#### NATIONAL AEROSPACE AND DEFENSE WORKFORCE COALITION—JULY 1995

##### B-2 PROCLAMATION

Catherine J. Vezzetti, Executive Director,  
Ed Olson, President, Southern California  
Professional Engineering Association, Westminster, California.

Mike Hall, President, UAW Local 848,  
Grand Prairie, Texas.

Harold J. Ammond, Executive Director, Association of Scientists & Professional Engineering Personal, Mt. Laurel, New Jersey.

Charles H. Bofferding III, Executive Director, Seattle Professional Engineering, Employees Association, Seattle, Washington.

Bob Duncan, Chairman, Council of Engineers & Scientists Organizations, Westminster, California.

Wayne Blawat, Chairman—Technicians, Steve Skattebo, Chairman Engineers, Leon M. Rapant, Committeeman.

Al Zdrojewski, Labor/Management Coordinator, Local 92 International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, Cudahy, Wisconsin.

Frank Souza, President, UAW Local 887, Paramount, California.

Dale Herron, President, Engineers & Scientists Guild, Palmdale, California.

Joseph Smarrella, Treasurer, United Steelworkers of America, District 1, Local 1190, Steubenville, Ohio.

Paul Almelda, National President, International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Captain Duane E. Woerth, First Vice President, Air Line Pilots Association, Washington, D.C.

Bill Boetger, IAM Business Rept, District Lodge 725, Area 2, Ontario, California.

Thelma Franklin, IAM President, Local 821, Ontario, California.

Doug Burrell, President, UAW Local 1921 New Orleans, Louisiana.

Ed Willis, President, UAW Local 647, Evendale, Ohio.

Frank Gyarmethy, President, UAW Local 1666, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Allen Holl, President, IAM & AW, LL 2020, Wichita, Kansas.

Harold Landry, Business Manager Local 3, International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Gary Eder, President, Salaried Employees Association, Hanover, Maryland.

Tony Forte, President, UAW Local 1059, Eddystone, Pennsylvania.

Gary Hawkins, President, UAW Local 128, Troy, Ohio.

Jeffrey D. Maska, President, Local 92, International Federation of Professional & Technical Engineers, Cudshy, Wisconsin.

Michael J. Gavin, President, Lodge 1509.

Frank Bunek, Committeeman, Blacksmith, Cudshy, Wisconsin.

Francis J. Owen, Committeeman, Local 663, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Cudshy, Wisconsin.

Anton Milewski, Vice President.

William Gregson, Committeeman, Local 140, International Association of Machinists, Die Sinkers, Cudahy, Wisconsin.

Michael J. Yokofich, President, Local 1862.

Gerald Svcek, Chairman, Local 1862, International Association of Machinists, Cudahy, Wisconsin.

Sandra L. Paradowski, Vice President, Local 85, Office of Professional Employees International Union Cudahy, Wisconsin.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Department of the Army's breast cancer research program which was included in this bill, the fiscal year 1996 Defense Appropriations Act. Thanks to the leadership of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman BILL YOUNG and his colleagues, H.R. 2126 provides \$100 million to continue that important work. I was pleased the subcommittee was able to honor the request that we in the New York delegation made for this vital research.

There is no question about the seriousness of this disease; 2.6 million women are living with breast cancer today. Thousands more will

be diagnosed with and will die from breast cancer this year. While we are beginning to make progress in understanding the disease, we have yet to learn how it is caused, how it is cured, and what means there are for prevention. Our fight cannot stop now.

With the increase in the number of women in the military, the need to address their health concerns, as well as those of women dependents of military personnel, continues to grow.

The Department of the Army's program has proved to be both efficient and effective, attracting more than 3,000 new proposals in the field of breast cancer research since the allocation of funding in fiscal year 1992. As a result, 460 of the most innovative proposals have received funding.

As there is still much research to be done, it is essential that this program continue. On behalf of the 2.6 million women with breast cancer, I thank the subcommittee for continued funding for breast cancer research and encourage my colleagues to support this essential program.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment being offered today by my colleague, Representative ROSA DELAURO. Her amendment would ensure that U.S. servicewomen and military dependents stationed overseas have access to safe, quality health care services.

An amendment being offered today by Congressman BOB DORNAN would prevent American servicewomen from exercising their legal right to an abortion. This would single out women who serve in the military overseas for a specific, unfair restriction by prohibiting overseas Department of Defense military facilities from providing privately funded abortions.

Mr. Chairman, American women have the right to obtain abortions in this country. Shouldn't American military women who are serving this country overseas have this same right? Especially if they pay for the abortion with their own money? To establish such a ban is grossly unfair and unjustifiable.

Without the DeLauro amendment, H.R. 2126 could drive women into desperate situations in which they would have to seek abortions from unsafe or unsanitary hospitals in foreign countries. Clearly, a pregnant woman is the one and only person who knows what is best for her, and she, in consultation with her family, doctor, and/or clergy, is the one who should make decisions affecting her body, her health, and her life.

I strongly support the DeLauro amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD] having assumed the chair, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, 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. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 205, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

An amendment striking sections 8021 and 8024 is considered as adopted.

Pursuant to House Resolution 205, is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Schroeder amendment number 85.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 8107. (a) LIMITATIONS ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY CONTRACTORS FOR POLITICAL ADVOCACY.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by any Federal contractor for an activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence Federal, State, or local legislation or agency action, including any of the following:

(A) Monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similarly activity.

(B) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through an attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any segment thereof, including any communication between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(C) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through communication with any member or employee of a legislative body or agency, or with any government official or employee who may participate in the formulation of the legislation or agency action, including any communication between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to engage in such an attempt or to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(2) Participating or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office, including monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similar activity.

(3) Participating in any judicial litigation or agency proceeding (including as an amicus curiae) in which agents or instrumentalities of Federal, State, or local governments are parties, other than litigation in which the contractor or potential contractor is a defendant appearing in its own behalf; is defending its tax-exempt status; or is challenging a government decision or action directed specifically at the powers, rights, or duties of that contractor or potential contractor.

(4) Allocating, disbursing, or contributing any funds or in-kind support to any individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for political advocacy for the previous Federal fiscal year exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO AWARD CONTRACTS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to award a contract when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the expenditures of the potential contractor (other than an individual person) for activities described in subsection (a) for any one of the previous five Federal fiscal years (excluding any fiscal year before 1996) exceeded the sum of—

(A) the first \$20,000,000 of the difference between the potential contractor's total expenditures made in the fiscal year and the total amount of Federal contracts and grants it was awarded in that fiscal year, multiplied by .05; and

(B) the remainder of the difference calculated in subparagraph (A), multiplied, by .01;

(2) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract to purchase or secure any goods or services (including dues and membership fees) from any other individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for activities described in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1995 exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year; or

(3) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract for a purpose (other than to purchase or secure goods or services) that was not specifically permitted by Congress in the law authorizing the contract.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The activities described in subsection (a) do not include any activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Making available the results of non-partisan analysis, study, research, or debate.

(2) Providing technical advice or assistance (where such advice would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action) to a government body or to a committee or other subdivision thereof in response to a written request by such body or subdivision, as the case may be.

(3) Communications between a contractor and its employees with respect to legislation, proposed legislation, agency action, or proposed agency action of direct interest to the contractor and such employees, other than communications described in subparagraph (C).

(4) Any communication with a governmental official or employee, other than—

(A) a communication with a member or employee of a legislative body or agency (where such communication would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action); or

(B) a communication the principal purpose of which is to influence legislation or agency action.

(5) Official communication by employees of State or local governments, or by organizations whose membership consists exclusively of State or local governments.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 238, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 645]

AYES—182

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Blute  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Burr  
Camp  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Clay  
Clement  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Danner  
Dellums  
Dickey  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Ehlers  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)

Frisa  
Furse  
Ganske  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hastert  
Heineman  
Hilleary  
Hinchee  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Hutchinson  
Jacobs  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kildee  
Klecza  
Klink  
Klug  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lowe  
Luther  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martini  
Mascara  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
Meehan  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Miller (FL)  
Mink  
Molinari

NOES—238

Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bliley  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Browder  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burton  
Buyer

Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Cardin  
Chambliss  
Chapman  
Chrysler  
Clayton  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Cooley  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Edwards  
Ehrlich

Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Orton  
Owens  
Payne (NJ)  
Pelosi  
Petri  
Porter  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Riggs  
Rohrabacher  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Scarborough  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shaw  
Shays  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Stark  
Stockman  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tate  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Lowe  
Traficant  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Waters  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Hobson  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Knollenberg  
LaHood  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
Schroeder  
Lofgren  
Lucas  
Martinez  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meek

Menendez  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Sabo  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shadegg

Shuster  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Viscosky  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (PA)  
White  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bishop  
DeFazio  
Dingell  
Maloney  
McKinney

Moakley  
Morella  
Radanovich  
Reynolds  
Roberts

Sisisky  
Towns  
Tucker  
Waldboltz

□ 1824

Mr. YATES and Mr. TORRES changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. HUTCHINSON, WELLER, FOX of Pennsylvania, HASTERT, BILBRAY, CHRISTENSEN, WHITFIELD, GOSS, CREMEANS, ORTON, HILLEARY, HEINEMAN, FRISA, GILLMOR, SALMON, BLUTE, LARGENT, and ENGLISH of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall 645. I was unavoidably detained, and had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommend.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Obey moves that the bill H.R. 2126 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instruction to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

On page 77, line 8, strike "\$250,000" and insert "\$200,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, section 8077 of this bill reads as follows:

None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated for payment on new contracts on which allowable costs charged to the government include payments for individual compensation at a rate in excess of \$250,000 per year.

This recommittal motion simply reduces that \$250,000 salary level to \$200,000. In essence what it says is that if any defense contractor wants to pay any individual a salary in excess of that paid to the President of the United States, they cannot do it with taxpayer funds through contracting, they have to do it out of their own corporate profits.

When you take a look at the total compensation provided to the CEO's of some of these corporations, you see one being paid \$7,287,000, one being paid \$5,827,000, another \$3,596,000, another \$3,538,000, and so on and so forth.

I would simply ask one question. Who do these people think they are, that they think that they are entitled to be compensated at a rate higher than the level of the President of the United States?

It seems to me that if we are asked to buy downsizing of the military budget, if we are asked to buy downsizing of corporations in general, we ought to also be taking a look at downsizing these outrageously high salaries paid to these corporate executives.

All this does is say that you cannot compensate any of these corporations for any salary in excess of the salary paid to the President of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman that we are very aware of this issue and it makes a minor change. We are proposed to accept the gentleman's motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

□ 1830

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instruction of the

House, I report the bill H.R. 2126 back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: by Mr. YOUNG of Florida on page 77, line 8, strike "\$250,000" and insert "\$200,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7, rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 294, nays 125, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No.646]

YEAS—294

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart	Hoke
Allard	Dickey	Holden
Archer	Dicks	Horn
Armye	Dixon	Hostettler
Bachus	Dooley	Houghton
Baesler	Doolittle	Hoyer
Baker (CA)	Dornan	Hunter
Baker (LA)	Dreier	Hutchinson
Ballenger	Duncan	Hyde
Barcia	Edwards	Inglis
Barr	Ehrlich	Istook
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Jacobs
Bartlett	English	Johnson (CT)
Barton	Ensign	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Eshoo	Johnson, Sam
Bateman	Everett	Jones
Bentsen	Ewing	Kaptur
Bereuter	Farr	Kasich
Bevill	Fawell	Kelly
Bilbray	Fazio	Kennedy (MA)
Bilirakis	Fields (TX)	Kennedy (RI)
Bliley	Flanagan	Kennelly
Blute	Foley	Kildee
Boehlert	Forbes	Kim
Boehner	Ford	King
Bonilla	Fowler	Kingston
Bono	Fox	Klink
Boucher	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Brewster	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Browder	Frisa	LaHood
Brownback	Frost	Largent
Bryant (TN)	Funderburk	Latham
Bunn	Gallegly	LaTourette
Bunning	Gedensson	Laughlin
Burr	Gekas	Lazio
Burton	Gephardt	Leach
Buyer	Geren	Lewis (CA)
Callahan	Gibbons	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Gilchrest	Lightfoot
Canady	Gillmor	Linder
Castle	Gilman	Lipinski
Chabot	Gonzalez	Livingston
Chambliss	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Chapman	Goss	Longley
Christensen	Graham	Lucas
Chrysler	Green	Manton
Clement	Greenwood	Manzullo
Clinger	Gunderson	Matsui
Clyburn	Gutknecht	McCollum
Coble	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Coburn	Hall (TX)	McDade
Coleman	Hamilton	McHale
Collins (GA)	Hancock	McHugh
Combest	Hansen	McInnis
Condit	Harman	McIntosh
Cox	Hastert	McKeon
Cramer	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Crane	Hastings (WA)	Meek
Creameans	Hayes	Metcalf
Cubin	Hayworth	Meyers
Cunningham	Hefley	Mica
Davis	Hefner	Miller (FL)
de la Garza	Heineman	Mineta
Deal	Herger	Mink
DeLauro	Hilleary	Molinari
DeLay	Hobson	Mollohan

Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Regula  
Richardson  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin

Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Traficant  
Visclosky  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff

NAYS—125

Ackerman	Ganske	Peterson (MN)
Andrews	Gordon	Petri
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Poshard
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Rahall
Beilenson	Hinchey	Ramstad
Berman	Hoekstra	Rangel
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Reed
Borski	Johnson (SD)	Riggs
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Klecaska	Roth
Bryant (TX)	Klug	Roukema
Camp	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard
Cardin	Lantos	Rush
Chenoweth	Levin	Sabo
Clay	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Clayton	Lincoln	Sawyer
Collins (IL)	Lofgren	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Lowey	Schumer
Conyers	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Cooley	Markey	Serrano
Costello	Martinez	Shays
Coyne	Martini	Skaggs
Crapo	Mascara	Slaughter
Danner	McCarthy	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Stokes
Dellums	Meehan	Studds
Deutsch	Menendez	Stupak
Doggett	Mfume	Torrice
Doyle	Miller (CA)	Upton
Durbin	Minge	Velazquez
Ehlers	Nadler	Vento
Engel	Neal	Volkmer
Evans	Oberstar	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Obey	Waxman
Fields (LA)	Olver	Williams
Filner	Orton	Wise
Flake	Owens	Woolsey
Foglietta	Pallone	Wyden
Frank (MA)	Pastor	Yates
Franks (NJ)	Payne (NJ)	Zimmer
Furse	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra	Jefferson	Reynolds
Bishop	Maloney	Sisisky
Dingell	McKinney	Towns
Dunn	Moakley	Tucker
Goodling	Morella	Waldholtz

□ 1847

Clerk announced the following pair on this vote:

Mrs. Waldholtz for, with Mrs. Maloney against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 2126 the clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross references, and to make other conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### HR 8664

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m., tomorrow morning, September 8, 1995.

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

There was no objection.

#### HR 1594

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-240) on the resolution (H. Res. 215) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1594) to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### HR 1655

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-241) on the resolution (H. Res. 216) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### HR 1670

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the rule that I have just filed on the Intelligence Authorization Act includes a requirement that amendments be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before they are offered on the floor.

Since it is possible that the House could take up this matter as soon as next Tuesday, and the House is not planning to be in session on Monday, it means that Members desiring to offer amendments to this bill should submit their amendments for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow.

Chairman SOLOMON already put Members on notice yesterday by a floor announcement and a "Dear Colleague" letter to each Member that a pre-printing requirement was likely on this bill.

This announcement is just intended as a reminder not to wait too late.

In addition, I wish to inform the House that the Rules Committee is planning to meet next Tuesday, September 12, on two bills; H.R. 1670, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act and H.R. 1162, the Deficit Reduction Lockbox Act.

The rules on each of these two bills may provide priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Amendments to be pre-printed would need to be signed by the Member and submitted at the Speaker's table.

The amendments would still need to be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Rules Committee or testify as long as amendments comply with the House rules.

#### HR 1905

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, without objection, that Mr. GOSS is appointed in lieu of Mr. DREIER as a conferee on S. 4.

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

#### HR 1905

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree with the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. BEVILL

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BEVILL moves that in resolving differences between the House and Senate with regard to projects and programs of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 1905, be instructed to select projects and programs within the scope of the conference with without regard to the proposal of the Administration to reduce the role of the Corps of Engineers in flood control, shore protection, and navigation projects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEVILL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama, as he always has, has discussed his motion with this side, and we have no objection.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Chair appoints the following conferees; Messrs: MYERS of Indiana ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, RIGGS, FRELINGHUYSEN, BUNN of Oregon, LIVINGSTON, BEVILL MR. FAZIO of California, CHAPMAN and OBEY:

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may be allowed to include tabular and extraneous material, on H.R. 1905.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1817, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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 Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

#### MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that in resolving the differences between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 1817, be instructed to not provide funding for non-quality of life projects added above the President's request, which are in excess of the cumulative amounts added for such projects in the House passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that when the House passed the military construction bill, it included added projects for high-priority quality-of-life projects such as barracks, child care centers, family housing, and medical facilities.

The bill also provided roughly \$150 million for projects that were not requested by the President for operational needs.

The other body, however, added some \$350 million in projects, many of which do not appear to fit anybody's definition of a high priority.

My motion, Mr. Speaker, provides very specific direction to the conferees that in resolving the differences between the House and the Senate on

projects that the most high-priority needs be addressed and that the cumulative level of funding for non-quality-of-life projects added by the Congress not exceed the level currently in the House bill, which is roughly \$150 million.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct conferees.

The committee has put quality-of-life projects first. We have worked hard in a bipartisan manner to fund troop housing, family housing, child development centers and medical projects. We have put our dollars where the Department of Defense needs them most.

We have funded projects that are priority locations.

So I urge my colleagues to support the gentleman's motion, and I support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would clarify this motion does not address any added projects specifically. Therefore, the motion does not preclude any specific project from being considered in conference. The motion simply limits the total amount of non-quality-of-life add-ons.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Messrs; CALLAHAN, MCDADE, MYERS of Indiana, PORTER, ISTOOK, WICKER, LIVINGSTON, HEFNER, FOGLIETTA, VIS-CLOSKY, TORRES, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

#### 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 H.R. 1817, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 1295b(h) of title 46, United States Code, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy the following Members of the House:

Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MANTON of New York.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### REHABILITATION NEEDED, NOT SURGERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, during the month of August, I met with many senior citizens who are very concerned about the proposed Republican Medicare reductions of \$270 billion. I am even more concerned that there are no specifics as to how the cuts will be made. The Republicans so far have refused to give us any details concerning their plan.

The public has the right to examine the Republican plan. Instead the Republicans are opting for the stealth attack approach of slipping cuts right by seniors before their plans can be analyzed.

Many Republicans are claiming that Medicare is going broke, which is simply not true. Medicare is more solvent today than it has been in a long time. The trustees report show that definitively.

As a matter of fact the trustees have spoken out against the Republican plans in a commentary entitled, "Rehabilitation Needed, Not Surgery,"

which was printed in the Los Angeles Times. I would like to submit this commentary for the RECORD.

The article outlines the fact that the Republicans did not stumble onto something new regarding the question of Medicare solvency.

In the last 20 years, the trustees reported several times that Medicare would run out of money in 4 years or 6 years. The recent trustee report extends solvency to an all-time high of 7 years, 1 more year than was the case last year. I wonder why Republicans did not raise this issue last year, when health care reform—to increase health coverage—was the biggest issue of the year?

Throughout the last 20 years questions of solvency have been raised and Congress worked together making the minor adjustments necessary to maintain Medicare's funding. Congress can work together again, if Republicans will drop their \$270 billion Medicare cut.

The trustees go on to say that the Republican's Medicare cuts are excessive, citing that "It is not necessary to cut benefits to ensure the fund's solvency." I believe the true motivation behind the largest Medicare cuts in history is giving the better-off a big tax cut. Republicans first propose taking \$270 billion out of Medicare and then call it reform.

Seniors in New Jersey realize what is really happening. They are being asked to come up with more than \$1,000 a year in out-of-pocket costs in order to finance a tax cut largely for the wealthy. It is simply not fair and those of us who care about seniors must fight to kill this terrible Republican proposal.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 28, 1995]

REHABILITATION NEEDED, NOT SURGERY

(By Robert E. Rubin, Donna E. Shalala, Robert B. Reich and Shirley S. Chater)

Our nation is involved in a serious examination of the status and future of Medicare. Congressional Republicans have called for \$270 billion in cuts over the next seven years, claiming that Medicare is facing a sudden and unprecedented financial crisis that President Clinton has not dealt with, and that all of the majority's cuts are necessary to avert it.

While there is a need to address the financial stability of Medicare, the congressional majority's claims are simply mistaken. As trustees of the Part A Medicare Trust Fund, which is the subject of the current debate, and authors of an annual report that regrettably has been used to distort the facts, we would like to set the record straight.

Concerns about the solvency of the Medicare Part A Trust Fund are not new. The solvency of the trust fund is of utmost concern to us all. Each year, the Medicare trustees undertake an examination to determine its short-term and long-term financial health. The most recent report notes that the trust fund is expected to run dry by 2002. While everyone agrees that we must take action to make sure that the fund has adequate resources, the claim that it is in a sudden crisis is unfounded.

The Medicare trustees have nine times warned that the trust fund would be insol-

vent within seven years. On each of those occasions, the sitting President and members of Congress from both political parties took appropriate action to strengthen the fund.

Far from being a sudden crisis, the situation has improved over the past few years. When President Clinton took office in 1993, the Medicare trustees predicted the fund would be exhausted in six years. The President offered a package of reforms to push back that date by three years and the Democrats in Congress passed the plan. In 1994, the President proposed a health reform plan that would have strengthened the fund for an additional five years.

So what has caused some members of Congress to become concerned about the fund? Certainly not the facts in this year's trustees report that these members continually cite. The report found that predictions about the solvency of the fund had improved by a year. The only thing that has really changed is the political needs of those who are hoping to use major Medicare cuts for other purposes.

President Clinton has presented a plan to extend the fund's life. Remarkably, some in Congress have said that the President has no plan to address the Medicare Trust Fund issue. But he most certainly does. Under the President's balanced budget plan, payments from the trust fund would be reduced by \$89 billion over the next seven years to ensure that Medicare benefits would be covered through October 2006—11 years from now.

The congressional majority's Medicare cuts are excessive; it is not necessary to cut benefits to ensure the fund's solvency. The congressional majority says that all of its proposed \$270 billion in Medicare cuts over seven years are necessary. Certainly, some of those savings would help shore up the fund, just as in the President's plan. But a substantial part of the cuts the Republicans seek—at least \$100 billion—would seriously hurt senior citizens without contributing one penny to the fund. None of those savings (taken out of what is called Medicare Part B, which basically covers visits to the doctor) would go to the Part A Trust Fund (which mostly covers hospital stays). As a result, those cuts would not extend the life of the trust fund by one day.

And those Part B cuts would come out of the pockets of Medicare beneficiaries, who might have to pay an average of \$1,650 per person or \$3,300 per couple more over seven years in premiums alone. Total out-of-pocket costs could increase by an average of \$2,825 per person or \$5,650 per couple over seven years. According to a new study by the Department of Health and Human Services, these increases would effectively push at least half a million senior citizens into poverty and dramatically increase the health care burden on all older and disabled Americans and their families. The President's plan, by contrast, protects Medicare beneficiaries from any new cost increases.

As Medicare trustees, we are responsible for making sure that the program continues to be there for our parents and grandparents as well as for our children and grandchildren. The President's balanced budget plan shows that we can address the short-term problems without taking thousands of dollars out of peoples' pockets; that would give us a chance to work on a long-term plan to preserve Medicare's financial health as the baby boom generation ages. By doing that, we can preserve the Medicare Trust Fund without losing the trust of older Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this year, as we celebrate the 75th anniversary of women's vote, our society has once again dusted off its perennial "women's question"

What do women want?

Well the events of this week, from the fight of women NGO's at the conference in Beijing to have their voices heard, to the fight of the brave Oregonian women who wanted simply to have a public hearing about Senator PACKWOOD's sexual misconduct, make one thing pretty clear.

Women want dignity and respect so that they have the same opportunities as men to achieve and contribute to their society.

Dignity and respect.

BEIJING CONFERENCE

Respect from Boutros-Ghali, who won't even go the U.N. Conference on Women, but gives it as a consolation prize to a country who is on global probation for its dismal human rights violation.

Respect from Chinese for the democratic ideals that allow freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

Respect from countries that practice traditions that degrade women. Examples: FGM; sold into the slavery of prostitution; doused with gasoline and burned to death because their dowries are deemed too small.

Respect in the workplace.

Which brings us to the Packwood case and the women who so bravely came forward with examples of Senator PACKWOOD's sexual misconduct.

This summer I met with 4 of the 17 women who brought the complaint against Senator PACKWOOD. They spoke of their outrage with Senator PACKWOOD's abuse of power. They said his behavior was "demeaning, disrespectful, and humiliating to those who are the victims."

As Senator MCCONNELL said today, "There was a habitual pattern of aggressive, blatantly sexual advances mostly directed at members of his own staff or other whose livelihoods were connected in some way to his power and authority as a Senator."

I applaud the Senate Ethics Committee for standing firm and clearly saying, we will not tolerate this type of behavior.

I found the committee's vote a real sea change. No doubt about it—having more women in the Senate—especially women like Senator BOXER, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator SNOWE who were willing to shake things up—helped to create this new climate.

The ruling is certainly shaking the foundations of the club. It's no secret that these guys have protected each other over and over again. The ruling is a signal that those days are over.

Most importantly, the vote shows that the Senate, and Congress, has evolved in understanding that women are in the workplace, and they deserve respect.

We tell private employers that this conduct will land them in court. Today, we tell elected officials, this behavior will kick them out of Congress.

Let this be a message for all public officials. You treat people who work for you with respect. They are not playthings, they are people. It all boils down to respect and dignity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### MORE BAD NEWS FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOEKSTRA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to talk about another company in our country and more bad news for America's workers as a result of NAFTA, the \$20 billion trade loser. This time the damage comes from Topeka, KS, where workers at the Flexel cellophane plant are being forced to take another pay cut, this time for 11 percent. This was reported in the August 31 issue of the Capital-Journal, which is their local newspaper. That means for a worker in that company making \$8.50 an hour they will now have their pay cut to close to \$8 an hour, and all this has happened after a wage freeze at that company that has been in effect since 1991. In fact, workers at Flexel have seen their wages drop from \$13 an hour 5 years ago now to the current proposal to ratchet them down even more, to \$8 an hour.

What has been happening to cause this ratcheting down of U.S. worker wages? Mexican-based cellophane manufacturing plants have been increasing their penetration of the United States market to nearly one-fifth, or 20 percent, of our marketplace, up from only 3 percent 4 years ago. Our workers are being forced again to compete against multinational companies that can set up shop anywhere on the globe in order to seek the lowest wages possible along with no environmental enforcement. In Mexico workers at those relocated cellophane plants earn about 50 cents an hour, and that is where America's wages are headed, my friends, and did you notice that the price of cellophane has not dropped in our grocery stores? You can figure out who is making the money off workers on both sides of the United States-Mexican border.

It is time to cancel NAFTA, go back to the drawing boards and reshape it, and stand up for the hard-working families of our continent who all are being taken to the cleaners, and, if I might quote from a retiree from that particular plant in Kansas, he tells us a little bit about what the story is in that community. He said originally du Pont company built what was then called the Tecumseh cellophane plant and

brought it on line in 1958, and back in those years that was the fifth plant in the United States making cellophane.

Mr. Speaker, the news articles I will include in the RECORD indicate that there are only two left in this country.

This worker went to work for that company in 1964 and retired in 1985. He says when he retired from the plant it was the last plant operating for du Pont in the United States making cellophane. About 1 year later it was sold to this owner, Flexel, out of Atlanta, GA, and when he left the company back in 1985, he was making just over \$12 an hour. Mr. Speaker, he wrote me because he was shocked to find 10 years later the workers in that plant were making so much less. He said:

Ms. KAPTUR, the imports from Mexico have had an impact on this plant and its workers, and I'm concerned because I still have a lot of my friends working there. Unfortunately all those workers in the United States and the low-paid workers in Mexico will gain no fairness, they will gain no equity, because there is nothing in the trade agreement that tries to compensate for the difference in living standards, political standards, and environmental standards between these two adjacent nations.

So, Mr. Speaker, this evening I will be submitting into the RECORD the entire story of what has happened in Topeka, KS, one community in our country that understands well the impact of footloose multinational corporations and what happens when the Government in Washington falls asleep and fails to protect the workers of this continent.

[The articles referred to are as follows:]

[From the Capital-Journal, Aug. 31, 1995]  
PAY CUT OF 11 PERCENT GOES INTO EFFECT ON MONDAY

(By Morgan Chilson)

An 11 percent pay cut will begin Monday at the Flexel plant in Tecumseh, company officials told employees Wednesday.

Pay cuts are part of a company-wide plan to reduce costs because of increased global competition and declining demand for cellophane, said Gerry Broz, site manager at the plant.

Broz also stated adamantly Wednesday that reports from employees that company officials walked out on negotiations with Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union, or UNITE, last week were "completely inaccurate."

"After almost 10 months of good-faith bargaining and agreement on most issues, the company submitted a final proposal last Thursday calling for an 11 percent pay cut and work-rule changes that would lead to additional cost savings," Broz said.

Broz told employees in meetings Wednesday that Flexel and the union deadlocked over the issue of wage concessions.

Flexel officials opened financial information to a union auditor in the spring so employees would understand the economic difficulties facing the company, Broz said. Despite that, employees continued to ask for a five to 10 percent wage increase, he said.

Broz didn't elaborate on what the additional money saving measures were, but employees highlighted the loss of premium pay or Sunday time-and-a-half pay.

The cuts change several regulations, such as what happens when an employee goes

home from work sick, according to Randal Carnegie, an employee at Flexel who attended a morning meeting Wednesday.

"On the original program, if you get sick and if you work over two hours and you go home after that two hours, you get eight hours pay," Carnegie said. "They've done away with that."

Carnegie said the company also will no longer pay for annual physicals for employees. That expense will be out-of-pocket for the portion insurance doesn't cover, he said.

For employees on full-time disability, the company will not begin payment of disability pay until after four days and then only with a doctor's excuse, Carnegie added. Disability pay did start the first day off work, he said.

Carnegie, who has been working at Flexel for one year, makes \$8.50 an hour at the plant. His hourly wage will drop to \$8.04 an hour under the new cuts.

A source familiar with the negotiating process who spoke on the condition of anonymity said the average base wage at the plant has decreased since 1993 to \$12.78 per hour. An 11 percent decrease would lower that average base rate to \$11.37.

The plant employs over 240 employees, the source said. The base wage has gone down from the 1993 average salary of \$13.66 per hour because of lower starting wages, the source said.

Flexel Corp., based in Atlanta, owns the two remaining cellophane plants in the United States, the one in Tecumseh and one in Covington, Ind.

The Covington plant felt its share of cutbacks in April, when about one-third of the plant's 345 employees were laid off, according to reports published in the Commercial News in Danville, Ill.

That newspaper reported 20 salaried and 80 hourly employees were laid off.

The last time employees were laid off at the Tecumseh plant was in 1989, when 12 salaried employees and 30 temporary employees were laid off.

"We don't want to cut Tecumseh wage roll jobs because we want to keep Tecumseh production levels high," Broz said. "So we have no choice but to cut wages."

Carnegie said many employees believe other cost-cutting measures weren't researched. For example, he said, workers currently are paid for lunch shifts and if that policy could be dropped, it would save the company 2.5 hours per week per person.

Broz said it is untrue that other cost-cutting measures haven't been considered.

#### FLEXEL WORKERS FACE PAY CUT

Mandatory employee meetings today at Flexel Corp. will determine what options are left for members of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union of America after negotiations with management came to a halt last week.

Employees of Flexel, one of two remaining cellophane manufacturing plants in the United States, voted in October 1994 to join ACTWU and then began working with Flexel's management to negotiate a contract. It never got that far.

Last Thursday, members of the management negotiating team walked out of negotiations after leaving their only offer on the table, a source familiar with the negotiations said Tuesday on condition of anonymity.

Jerry Broze, site superintendent at the Flexel plant in Tecumseh, said the company would comment today on labor negotiations.

The source said Flexel's offer involved a reduction of \$1.4 million, which amounted to an 11 percent pay cut for employees. When totaled in with other aspects of the offer, including no more premium or overtime pay

for working on Sundays, employees would be taking about a 17 percent cut in pay and benefits, the source said.

"They basically put this crazy offer on the table and said it was because of their financial problems," said David Martinez, who has worked at Flexel for 16 years. He began with the company when it was owned by Du Pont. "We came through with a lot of suggestions of things that they could save money on. They just basically put that offer on and never negotiated anything in good faith."

Workers were told the new policies would be instituted Friday, and many think the mandatory meetings today will announce that plan.

Martinez said employees haven't received pay raises in more than four years, which has added to their disenchantment with management.

Wages were frozen in December 1991 at the average salary of \$13.66 an hour, according to a report in 1993.

Martinez alleged poor corporate management was the reason for the company's woes.

Martinez cited the purchase of a machine to make rubber gloves that is boxed and sitting in the warehouse unused as an example of poor decisionmaking by Flexel.

In previous years, management said the company experienced financial difficulties because of unfair competition from Mexico. Mexican companies export cellophane to the United States without paying a tariff.

In 1991, Lindsey Walters, president of the Atlanta-based Flexel Corp., said Mexican cellophane plants increased their penetration of U.S. markets to 18 percent from 3 percent during the previous four years.

#### OUTRAGEOUS THAT LONG ISLAND'S VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS MUST TAKE VACATION TIME FOR FIGHTING THEIR WORST EVER FIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Nation for many years have heard about the values of volunteerism. Our own President of the United States came up with a program where he thought we ought to pay volunteers in a program called national service. Tonight I want to address the floor for the purposes of talking about some tremendous individuals who work for the Federal Government. They are the postal workers of this Nation, the men and women who deliver our mail and the people like in my own village of Quogue, Long Island, where we go down to the mail and the employees in the post office are our friends there. They are our neighbors. They donate time to their communities, and a large number of these postal workers on Long Island also happen to be volunteers in the local fire company, volunteer firefighters.

Last evening I addressed this floor and talked about the recent fire on Long Island in which over 5,000 volunteer firefighters made a tremendous contribution. They saved our property, they saved our communities. At threat during that fire could very well have been the local post office in Eastport, the local post office in Speonk, the

local post office in West Hampton, Long Island, NY. All of these facilities, had they burned, would have cost the taxpayers many, many dollars to replace these fine postal facilities.

I am forced to come to the floor this evening because of an outrageous incident that I have learned involving the U.S. Postal Service. The postal employees who are our friends, many of our relatives, our neighbors, on Long Island who donated their time to fight the worst fire in Long Island history are now being told by their supervisors at the Postal Service in Washington that they are going to have to take vacation time to cover their absence from work to fight the worst fire in Long Island history. Mr. Speaker, I find that outrageous, I find that the worst example in government of bureaucratic mumbo-jumbo gobbledegook that serves no reasonable purpose. We have small employers on Long Island, delis, Main Street merchants, who can ill afford the loss of an employee for a full week, and yet these smallest of businesses are paying their employees who had to leave the business to go fight the fire.

□ 1915

These volunteer firefighters are the best example of volunteerism, of courage, of bravery, and I find it outrageous that the United States Postal Service, the supervisors in Washington, have deemed them not worthy of being paid while they fought to save our communities.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous. I attempted to reach the Postmaster General of the United States, but I was told he was in Hawaii, and he has been there for about a week, and he is jetting home to Washington as we speak. I am hopeful that we can convince the Postmaster General and the hierarchy of the United States Postal Service that when men and women give up their time, thousands of hours to train themselves to stay up in the latest techniques in fighting fires, that they ought to be paid when the community is at risk, such as our communities on Long Island were at risk. I find it outrageous, as I have said repeatedly, that the United States Postal Service in Washington does not deem the volunteerism of its own postal workers in this time of need as worthy of reimbursement for their time away from the post office.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage the United States Postal Service to rethink its position, to pay the employees of the Postal Service who gave of their time to save our communities during the fire, and I ask them, again, to reconsider their position.

#### THE TRUTH ON MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to discuss a couple of items tonight. A previous speaker on the other side of the aisle actually stood in the House Chamber just minutes ago and said that there is no problem with Medicare, that Medicare is not going bankrupt. I just find that unbelievable, that somebody would be still arguing about the April trustees' report, when it was offered by Clinton appointees, including Secretaries Shalala, Reich and Rubin, who are all appointed by Clinton. They are his right arm, for crying out loud. Drawing partisan lines on a trustee report that really is a Democrat report. I am flabbergasted, after a month back in the district talking to senior citizens, that somebody is at that stage of the debate.

The stage on this side of the aisle, number one, is that this is a bipartisan problem. People that get Medicare, they do not care if they are Democrats or Republicans who are writing the legislation. They want health care.

We are not going to get into a partisan debate on Medicare. What we are going to do is try to preserve and protect it so that it will be there tomorrow, and we are going to try to slow down the rate of increase. Medical inflation on average is about 4.5 percent. Medicare growth has been 11 percent. We are going to increase the benefit to each recipient from about \$4,800 to \$6,400. So the door is open. Any ideas from either party are welcome, but we are going to solve this problem in a bipartisan way. We are going to simplify Medicare, and protect and preserve it.

The gentleman from the 9th District of Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] joins us, and I yield the floor to him.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I too am just somewhat flabbergasted by the comments made by the previous speaker from the other side of the aisle regarding the cuts in Medicare. He made one statement that Medicare is more solvent today than it has been in a long time. We had problems with it in the past and the reaction of this Congress was to make minor adjustments in the Medicare program.

Well, what the Democrats consider as "minor adjustments" is raising taxes. That is not what the American people want. The American people want a solid program with solid funding, not a program that is a runaway program that requires raising taxes to fix it.

Congress must act responsibly. We are charged by the American people to take a program like Medicare, to reform, revise, and improve that program to where we take money from the taxpayers and we spend it wisely. When it comes time for folks to receive the benefits of Medicare, they ought to be able to receive those benefits without the necessity of raising taxes.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, we actually raised the taxes on Medicare in 1993. All that did is postpone the bankruptcy I think three to six months. So raising taxes is not the solution.

On the subject of taxes, I wanted to say this. We are going to have some important tax debates coming up on flat tax and consumption tax. The average American family in the 1950's paid 2 percent Federal income tax. The average American family today pays 24 percent Federal income tax. During that period of time, the State and local and other Federal taxes have increased to the extent that middle class families now are paying about 40 to 50 percent taxes, while the real wages have fallen. One of the biggest crises in America today is that the middle class are working their tails off just to stay in place. In many cases they are not even breaking even. So tax increases year after year are anything but the answer. We have got to increase the real wages and increase opportunities and jobs for people.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. It was interesting too that the previous speaker stated that we as Republicans are providing tax cuts to middle class America, and those tax cuts are being given at the expense of Medicare recipients. That is absolutely not true. What he did not tell the folks is that Medicare is a trust fund. Payments that are received by the Federal Government from taxpayers for Medicare go into a trust fund. Those funds can be used only for Medicare beneficiaries.

Tax cuts have no relationship to Medicare trust funds. The tax cuts being given to middle class America are being given to those folks you just talked about, the folks who are hard working, scraping by day-to-day to make a decent living for their families. Those are the folks that are going to receive the benefit of the tax cuts that are going to be put in place. That has absolutely no relationship to Medicare.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the point the gentleman has also made on taxes is that in reality we have not passed a tax cut. We have not really passed anything, because the House, while it has done all kinds of work, all kinds of reform legislation to reduce the size of government and the micro-management out of Washington, legislation which has increased personal responsibility and increased personal freedom, these great pieces of legislation have not moved in the other body, nor have they been signed by the Executive Branch. Here we are coming into a rude awakening October 1st.

#### AMERICANS WANT CHANGE NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I went home for the August recess and a funny thing happened before I went home for the August recess. I listened to all these political pundits in Washington, read Wall Street Journal articles that said this is the most revolutionary House of Representatives ses-

sion since Reconstruction. I heard people telling us day in and day out we were too radical, revolutionary, too extreme, we were moving too fast.

Then I went home, and I held 30 town hall meetings across my district. I made over 100 speeches across my district. I talked to editorial boards, I went on talk radio, I went on TV. I worked my district for over 30 days and talked to more people in my district than I bet any other elected official has ever worked the district in 30 days in northwest Florida, and the message I got from them was quite different than the message I get from reading the Washington Post or listening to Peter Jennings.

They said what are you doing up there? Nothing is happening. You guys need to push it forward. You need to push change. We sent you up to Washington, DC. in November to make a difference and make a change. Now, do something.

I will tell you, it was a rude awakening. It shows how there is an incredible disconnect between Washington, DC. speak and what people in middle America are saying, and in the area that political pundits consider fly-over space between Washington, DC and Hollywood, CA.

Let me tell you something: The same voter anger that was out there in November of 1994 is still out there in August and September of 1995, and the Americans want us to move forward with our revolutionary agenda.

Now, they say it is revolutionary. I am going to tell you, I do not think it is revolutionary to balance the budget. I do not think it is so radical for the Congress to only do what middle class Americans have done for over 200 years, and only spend as much money as they take in. I do not think it is radical to cut burdensome regulations. I do not think it is extreme to give people their money and their power back.

What is so extreme and revolutionary to adhering to the Constitution? If the 10th amendment tells us that the Federal Government can only do what the Constitution specifically says it can do, and then the rest of the powers are reserved to the people and to the States, that ain't revolutionary by 1995 standards. Let us quit lying to the American people. That may have been revolutionary back 230 years ago, but let me tell you, it is constitutional mainstream thought today. The American people have realized it. I am just wondering when everybody else inside the beltway is going to realize it.

I will tell you, my feeling is if that is revolutionary, then count me in. We have got to cut taxes. We have got to balance the budget. We have got to slash regulations. My residents are telling me get us out of the United Nations and get the United Nations off American soil. They say cut corporate welfare. They say get the IRS off our backs. They say do something, make something happen, make a difference.

Well, let me tell you something. I came up here and I was fired up. I said

man, I cannot wait to get up to Washington, DC. I have not felt this fired up in over a year since before I came up here and campaigned to get into Congress the first time.

Then the first day back, I have Commerce Secretary Ron Brown come to my committee and testify under oath, under oath, that there is not a penny of corporate welfare in the Department of Commerce budget and that we should not abolish the Department of Commerce.

Let me tell you something, that is perjury. Plain and simple, that is perjury. The Department of Commerce is stocked with corporate welfare. Everybody in this body knows it. The corporations that get their windfalls from it know it. Bill Clinton knows it, Ron Brown knows it, the administration knows it.

We need to abolish the Department of Commerce. There is a plan coming before this house that is passing through committee that it needs to be abolished. We need to stop handing out corporate welfare, and we need to get Ron Brown, Bill Clinton and the Democrats in this House to support our bill. Abolish the Department of Commerce.

Then we need to move on and abolish the Department of Education bureaucracy, set up in 1979 as a political payoff to the teachers union. We have gone from spending \$14 to \$33 billion on education in the last 15 years and what has it gotten us? Declining test scores, an increase of violence in schools and dropout rates, and an increase in all the things we do not want. It is micro-management from Washington, DC.

When are they going to learn inside the Beltway that Washington, DC cannot micro-manage every single problem across America? We were sent up here to make a difference. We need to stay focused and make a difference, because Americans want change.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are going to deliver to them.

#### THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I will continue my dialogue with my friend from the First District of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON. We want to talk for a minute about the process we have been going through here in Congress for the last couple of weeks before the recess and a couple days since we have been back, and that is the appropriations process. We have been taking the money that is received by the government from the taxpayers and deciding exactly how that money ought to be spent, which departments ought to receive what amount of money, what programs ought to be funded, and what programs ought not to be funded.

One thing that we have done, we have made severe cuts in Federal spending. We are going to continue to make severe cuts in Federal spending. We are

not going to accomplish all of the cuts that need to be made in this session of Congress, but we have made a giant step in the right direction.

The gentleman from the First District of course is on the Committee on Appropriations, and he may want to address some specific items we have dealt with over the last couple of years.

Mr. KINGSTON. What we have done is we have eliminated, where we can, we have consolidated, we have reduced, and, in spending we have increased in others, tried to hold the line on. But, for example, there are 163 different Federal jobs training programs, 240 Federal education programs; there are 30 different nutrition programs. Clearly some of these can be eliminated or consolidated so that we can get more money to the needy, where that is required, and balance the budget more than anything.

Out of the 13 appropriations bills we have passed, 12 of them in the House, they all move us toward a balanced budget by the year 2002. I wish, and I know you do, I wish we could do it sooner. But we are working on the process. For the first time ever, when we pass that last appropriations bill, the DC appropriations bill, we have passed a budget that moves towards a balanced budget with a clear ending in sight.

Unfortunately, as you have pointed out, the folks on the other side of the Capitol, the other body, have not passed a lot of the legislation because not only are we trying to balance the budget, but we are trying to reduce the bureaucracy, reduce the micro-management out of Washington, the regulatory burden, and so forth, and increase personal responsibility. They have not done a thing over there, not one thing.

On October 1 the fiscal year ends, and the Federal budget, it is time for a showdown. It has been called up here the great train wreck will be coming, but I think it is going to be the rude awakening or the reality check. Do you want the status quo to continue? The President is going to make that decision. Should the Government continue or is he going to want to shut it down?

□ 1930

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Spending has been out of control in Congress for too many years now. We have not had a balanced budget in 25 years. We run the largest business in the world right here in this Chamber. And if any member of the business community across the United States ran their business like Congress has been running the business of this country, they would not last 60 days. It is time we put responsibility back in government. That is one thing that November 8 was all about.

Mr. KINGSTON. Just to underscore what you are saying, when Price Waterhouse came in to do the audit, it was Price Waterhouse that came in, they could not audit the House books.

There were too many old-ball ways of doing business. So too many—

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Too many pockets full of money out there and too many strange-looking expenditures of tax money.

But we have done things like today, I was extremely proud that we passed a defense appropriation bill today. I am a member of the Committee on national Security. We have worked extremely hard over the last 7 months, 8 months to put together a defense bill that ensures that we will always be the world's strongest military power. We are the world's greatest country because we are the world's strongest military power. I was very pleased today that that defense appropriations bill passed by a large bipartisan margin. I think we are going to get the military in this country back on the right track because we have cut the defense budget every year for the last 7 years. We have now restored the money. More importantly, we are spending the money from a defense standpoint where the money needs to be spent.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, it is interesting to note that part of the debate today was interrupted for a Joint Chiefs of Staff briefing to Members of Congress on Bosnia.

It is still a very dangerous world. I believe the military budget is still down 30 or 40 percent of what it was 10 years ago. We are at \$244 billion, I believe it was up to about \$250 billion. I am not 100 percent sure on those numbers offhand. I have them in my office, but I know that the military budget has fallen tremendously from where it was in the mid-1980's.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. And there were some reasons why that should happen. As the cold war with Russia has come to an end, it is time to downsize the military, to get it down to a more manageable figure and something that we can afford. That has been true over the last several years. That is one reason the Defense Department budget has been reduced.

#### PLANNING FOR AMERICA'S ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOEKSTRA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I concluded some remarks related to the state of the economy and what it means to working people and members of labor unions. I hastily discussed a solution to the problem at that time. Today I would like to go back and do a more thorough discussion of the solution to the problem.

I laid out the problem yesterday. I think it is only fitting that we spend as much time discussing a proposed solution to it.

I do want to recapitulate a statement that started the whole process yester-

day. That was a statement, I had read a series of statements that I had read from an article that was produced by Lester Thurow. It was an op-ed article in the Sunday, September 3, New York Times.

I was struck by the opening paragraph of that article. The opening paragraph I would like to quote again:

No country without a revolution or military defeat and subsequent occupation has ever experienced such a sharp shift in the distribution of earnings as America has in the last generation. At no other time have median wages of American men fallen for more than two decades. Never before have a majority of American workers suffered real wage reductions while the per capita domestic product was advancing.

I think that is a very strong statement by Lester Thurow, who is a professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is just making a factual statement. But it is a very compact and focused statement that all of us ought to really think seriously about.

Mr. Thurow is not a progressive or liberal or politician. Mr. Thurow is an economist. Mr. Thurow I think has been on record numerous times as supporting free trade. He probably supported NAFTA and GATT. Mr. Thurow is not an ideologue. He is an economist, very much respected. Written about 10 books. He has been on the Hill at various hearings testifying numerous times before the Senate and the House, well respected.

I think it is important to take a look at that opening statement and some other things he says, including a statement at the end of his article where he talks about the family.

The traditional family—I am quoting Mr. Thurow again: The traditional family is being destroyed not by misguided social welfare programs coming from Washington, although there are some Government initiatives that have undermined family structure, but by a modern economic system that is not congruent with family values. Besides falling real wages, America's other economic problems pale in significance. The remedies lie in major public and private investments in research and development and in creating skilled workers to ensure that tomorrow's high-wage brain power industries generate much of their employment in the United States. Yet if one looks at the weak policy proposals of both Democrats and Republicans, it is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

So Mr. Thurow, the economist, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has sort of summed up the predicament of where we are, and he only touched on the solution. When he says we need a remedy in the area of public and private investment and research and development and in creating skilled workers to ensure that tomorrow's high-wage brain power industries generate much of their employment in the

United States, I would like to begin at that point really today.

The question is, what are we doing? Mr. Thurow seems to think Democrats are not doing anything significant and also Republicans are not doing anything significant to deal with the remedy. We have a phenomenon which is very real. Everybody factually agrees that this is an unprecedented phenomenon. No country without a revolution or a military defeat and subsequent occupation has ever experienced such a sharp shift in the distribution of earnings as America has in the last generation.

At no other time have median wages of American men fallen for more than two decades. Never before have a majority of American workers suffered real wage reduction while the per capita domestic product was advancing. Our gross national product is advancing. The profits of our corporations are escalating. They have increased over the last 10 years. They are at record levels this year and last year.

We have a very productive economy. We have a very productive private sector, but all boats are not being lifted. In fact, at another point in his article, Mr. Thurow, Dr. Thurow says that the tide rose but 80 percent of the boats sank.

So we have a situation, the tide is rising, continues to rise, but the boats are sinking. The productivity is going up. The profits are going up. But jobs are being lost.

We hear numbers every month about the number of jobs created, how so many more jobs are being created. But it is a simple fact that almost everybody knows that the jobs that are being created are in the service sector at far lower wages than the jobs that are being lost. And every day there are new announcements of mergers and various new arrangements among the private sector, conglomerates, that result in a decrease in the number of jobs available, a downsizing and streamlining of jobs so people in large numbers are losing out as the economy overall advances. What do you do when America's gross national product is increasing, the profits are increasing, what happens, what has to happen?

Twenty percent, according to Mr. Thurow, among the men, the top 20 percent of the labor force has been winning all of the country's wage increases for more than two decades. So 20 percent are doing fairly well right now.

There is a danger though, because at another point Mr. Thurow points out that with our global economy where anything can be made anywhere and sold anywhere, the supply of cheap, often well-educated labor in the Third World is having a big effect on First World wages. So the men in that 20 percent are also threatened.

He points out with an example. Quoting Mr. Thurow: One month's wages for a Seattle software engineer gets the entire—gets the same company an equally good engineer in Ban-

galore, India, for a whole year. In other words, the Bangalore, India, software engineer will work for one-twelfth of the wages of the Seattle engineer, software engineer.

Educated, educated, high skilled, that is a new threat.

So to dwell on looking at the solution, we have unprecedented prosperity on one hand. The prosperity is defined as the gross national product increase, profits increase, private sector is booming. CEO's are making far more than they ever made. How do we deal with a situation where there is a great transition taking place? Yes, we cannot run back the clock. We cannot deny the global economy.

I do not think we should have moved as fast as we did on NAFTA and GATT, but the reality is that the global marketplace is taking hold. Reality is that capitalism is the economy of the present and capitalism will be the economy of the future. There is no alternative to capitalism. There are variations on it. The Chinese are moving toward a capitalism that is very different from the capitalism in America and the Russians are planning on a capitalism that is very, different.

The French practice a capitalism on an ongoing basis that is very, very different. There are differences, but basically capitalism is the way of the future. The market economy is the way of the future. Nobody wants to turn back the clock. I do not think they have the power to turn back the clock. But how do you operate within the situation that exists? It is the reality, and what is the creative approach to this reality?

One creative approach of course is to move to capture a portion of the resources of the productivity, of the profits and use a portion of those profits to fund, to finance a transition. We hope that, as it has been in the past, of an industrial revolution, we hope this information age revolution will also over time work itself out.

Nobody can predict what capitalism is going to do. Nobody can predict the future with any certainty. It is not planned, capitalism is not planned. So we have to depend on the same kind of phenomena that developed in the industrial revolution and hope that it is going to work itself out over time.

Over time, we are going to have things happen which we cannot even predict now. But we know we are in a transition right now. We know that for the last two decades the wages of American men have fallen. We know that for the last two decades, only 20 percent of the labor force has benefited from the economy and that fewer and fewer of them are included in the big economic boom that is going on now. So how do we handle it?

We have to finance a transition. We have to realize, this is the transitional period, this is the period where large numbers of people are beginning to feel the pinch. Large numbers are suffering. This is a period where the trend is pret-

ty clear. More jobs are going to be lost over the next year or so.

There may probably be an escalation of the number of jobs that are lost in middle management, of the number of jobs that are loss in clerical pursuits, of the number of jobs that are lost in semi-skilled factory work because the gains of computerization and automation eliminate those people first.

The irony of it is that you may have unskilled workers having more opportunities in a few years than the highly educated. The educated people, you may reverse this whole thing. The service people may be able to drive their wages up because the supply of service people especially in services like plumbing and electricians and a number of service people may find that they can command higher and higher wages because there is a greater need for them and they cannot be replaced.

□ 1945

You cannot move their jobs overseas. If you are going to build houses, you cannot take a carpenter's job and take it overseas and build housing, if you are going to install plumbing, et cetera.

There are some jobs that will be able to make some demands, but the largest number of people are employed in manufacturing jobs, in big financial organizations, the clerical jobs, et cetera. They are definitely, the trend is obvious, going to be without jobs.

How do we deal with this transitional period? It may last for 10 years, it may last for another 20 years, but definitely we are in a transitional period.

It is not the job of the private sector to deal with this problem. The private sector is in business to make money. Capitalism, they may have ads on the television that say that they exist to make America great, they exist to improve life for humankind, and you have all heard the ads for General Motors and General Electric and Archer Daniels Midland. They all have an image to project, to make it appear that one of their primary concerns is the fate of humankind or the comfort of the Nation.

Those are all auxiliary concerns. I will not question their motives, but they do not pretend that that is their primary business. Every private sector enterprise is in business to make money, to earn profits, and they are driven by the need for profits.

It does not matter how prosperous they are, they cannot afford to let competitors get ahead of them in terms of their profit margin. It only spells trouble down the road. Even IBM slipped and stumbled. You can never get too big in the private sector, in the capitalist economy, so big that you are secure.

We cannot criticize private industry for making profits. Let us get off the sentimental trip of expecting private industry to take care of the needs of the people. Private industry is not responsible for providing an economy

which is fair and just. Private industry is not responsible for providing job training. It is the Government.

We are elected officials, Congress Members, Members of the Senate, Members of the House, members of the State legislatures, members of the city councils, the mayors. We are elected to look after the general welfare, to provide for the general welfare. It is our duty.

If that means that we upset some of the profitmaking enterprises, that we upset the corporations, that we upset the people who are generating the wealth in some way, then so be it. It is our duty to take care of the general welfare.

Only elected officials have that duty. Corporations do not have that duty. Corporations would not be able to exist if they assumed that duty. Whatever they say, attempt to project to confuse us, they are not concerned with the general welfare except as a peripheral issue.

If we are responsible, if the President of the United States is responsible for the state of the American economy, and the Congress and all the other elected officials who make decisions about the lives of people and who are responsible for keeping our society going, then we must take action to deal with a transitional period where things are happening that never happened before.

We never saw prosperity before which was not shared by all of the people. We never saw prosperity before which did not automatically trickle down. This trickling down stopped some time ago. According to Mr. Thurow, we have been in this predicament for two decades now, 20 years. We are still talking about trickle-down economics.

We are still talking about giving big tax breaks to corporations, letting them invest in activities which create jobs. Well, they invest, but they may make their investment in more machinery, more automation, more computerization, or they may make their investment overseas. Wherever the profits will be highest or whatever actions produce the highest profits is what they will do. That is what they are paid to do, but they must look at the situation and say, what can we do in this situation?

One of the things that we have to do is look at taxation policies, because only through gaining more revenue will we be able to finance a transition period. I am sorry, that is one way. One way to finance a transition period is to streamline expenditures, change our expenditures and our priorities, and use the money that we save in Government from changing the priorities and from eliminating waste to finance a transition period agenda. The other way is to reach into the area of prosperity, the corporate sector, and get more revenues to deal with the crisis that we face.

Of course the knee-jerk reaction of both parties is that this is a tax-and-

spend liberal you have got talking to you, this is a tax-and-spend liberal who wants to go after more taxes. How dare anybody propose more taxes.

Well, this particular liberal says we need less taxation in the area of income tax on families and individuals. In 1943 families and individuals were paying 27 percent of the total tax burden. Corporations in 1943 were responsible for 40 percent, 39.8 percent of the total tax burden.

So corporations over the period since 1943, to the present, have been able to manipulate the tax laws, or they have been able to convince and to do whatever is necessary to get Government decisionmakers, most of them on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the rest of us who vote for the things that they bring to the floor. When the Committee on Ways and Means comes to the floor, they will not allow any amendments.

It is very difficult to make any adjustments, but as a Member I cannot tell my constituents that I do not have some burden of guilt on me. Everybody who is a decisionmaker that allows this to happen is guilty. We have been guilty of allowing the American people to be swindled since 1943, because the amount of taxes being paid by corporations has gone steadily down to the point now where it is 11.1 percent of the total tax burden, while the amount of taxes paid by individuals and families has gone up from 27 percent to 44.1 percent.

We have created a reason for the American people to be angry at us, only you have to know how to focus your anger. You have a right to be angry about high taxes. The taxes are not fair, not just. Individuals and families are paying too much in taxes. You heard this from a liberal, a progressive. Corporations, on the other hand, have swindled us because they are paying far less than their fair share.

What we need is a balance of the tax burden. While we are trying to balance the budget, we should consider balancing the tax burden. We should not rush into this. There is no need to be revolutionary about it. Let us move it slowly and set as an objective an equalization of the tax burden by the year 2005.

I agree with the President's analysis that we should not rush things and remake Government in 7 years. Let us take 10 years to remake Government. Let us set a goal. Let us say that by the year 2005, we are going to balance the tax burden and have corporations paying an equal amount of the tax burden with individuals and families. If you set that kind of goal and follow it, you can only win the praises of the people because that means taxes come down for families and individuals. It means that nobody can make the charge of tax-and-spend when it comes to families and individuals certainly. It means that fairness will relieve American families of a burden and the peo-

ple who are making the money, the corporations are making the money, there is no relationship between their profits and the number of people who are working. The number of people that are working goes down, people are making as individuals and families less money, corporations are making more money, it is only fair, and even if they were not, it would only be fair that we balance off the tax burden.

Why in 1943 was it the opposite? Why was almost 40 percent of the tax burden being carried by corporations and only 27 percent by individuals? And why now is it so out of balance? It went down even as low as 8 percent under Ronald Reagan in 1982. Eight percent was the portion of the burden being borne by corporations while individuals at that time were still at 44 percent. So you have a situation where part of the solution is we need more revenue directed at job training and education. That is the obvious way. There may be some other things that can be done to solve the present problem. We need more revenue directed at job training and education in order to be able to get out of the present bind where the workers and individuals of this Nation are slipping further and further behind while the corporate sector, 5 percent of the population, is going ahead with higher and higher profits.

A just solution is the duty of the people who are elected, the President, Members of Congress, Members of the Senate, we have a duty to solve this problem. I see no other way to solve it unless you have the resources to solve it with. What would you do with the resources that you gained from raising taxes on corporations? You would use it to make an unprecedented education system in this country, an education system which nobody can sit and predict what the components should be, but we could begin a process of working at it with research and development, with implementation of experimentation, with the application of computerization and automation and all kinds of new things which would help enhance the education system, an education system for tomorrow that is unlike any that exists now in Japan or Germany, that is not the way to go. We need an exciting classroom that captures the attention of young people and holds them. We need a classroom that can put a youngster who is a slow learner off into a corner and by use of some kind of repetitive action, either by a computerized program or a videotape that he responds to interactively, there are a number of things underway now which offer the answer for the future. We need all of those things. We need to have every American school have whatever is available. We know that computerization requires that students be computer literate for tomorrow. We know that already. So there should not be a school in the country that does not have an ample supply of computers.

Oh, they cost a lot of money, we might say. Let us get whatever money we need to do that by cutting waste, setting priorities differently, and by raising new revenues where we need them. Those are the two approaches that we should follow.

It is doable. The American people have to say it must be done. The American people have to say, we are angry and we know what we are angry about. We are angry and we are angry at Government. We are angry at elected officials and we have good reason to be angry at elected officials.

People say, well, why are they not angry at corporations? The corporations took their jobs. That is a waste of energy. Corporations are in business to make money. Therefore, you have to turn to your elected officials and say to the elected officials, you have to hold the corporations in line in terms of their responsibilities, and their responsibility, the major contribution they can make, is to generate more revenue where revenue is needed in order to finance a transition period while we deal with the problem of a declining standard of living of American families and American workers.

Herein lies the solution. I think we need to appoint a tax commission, a commission on creative revenues. I think we ought to have a commission similar to the base closing commission, some kind of objective group of experts who would come back to the Congress and the President, and we would have the final say, Congress has the final word on the base closings commission. For years we could not close bases, for years, they were an inefficient, wasteful operation out there and it has not been totally solved. The base closing commission has problems, it is not perfect, but we are moving at a much more reasonable, scientific, logical way to close down bases than we ever did before. Hard decisions are being made by the base closing commission in connection with elected officials. Let us have a creative revenue commission that does the same kind of thing. Instead of relying on the Committee on Ways and Means, which has sold us out, which has swindled the American people since 1943, since the corporate sector started getting greater and greater breaks, paying less and less taxes and the individuals and families started paying more, you have a situation where our interests were not being served by the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee. The political process has broken down.

□ 2000

And it seems never to be able to get itself together again.

I do not have any faith, there are no proposals on the table to give you any reason to believe that it is going to start self-correcting. In the absence of self-correcting, we need outside forces. We have brilliant people in America

that could be a part of a creative revenue situation.

Let me say to every State and every city that you have a similar problem and many States now have surpluses and are prosperous. Many cities are prosperous, but have little surplus. But there are an equal number or a majority of cities across the country who are struggling to make revenues and expenditures balance, so cities are in great trouble.

There are a number of States in great difficulty in terms of making revenues and expenditures balance, so you have the same problem.

There ought to be a clear message sent out to liberals and to progressives, and the people on my side of the aisle, Democrats, whatever name you want to take or want to be called, we need to preoccupy ourselves. We need to focus far more on revenue. Revenue policies and tax policies have been neglected by the progressives and the liberals. We do not have any new ideas to propose.

We have not seen any new ideas for a long, long time. Somehow we think that that is the dirty part of it. We will just focus on the expenditures and set priorities and talking about people's needs, all of which are necessary.

People need Medicare, and we are going to fight hard to make certain that Medicare benefits are not cut. We are going to fight hard to make certain that Medicare premiums do not go up. We do not want senior citizens eating dog food in order to pay for their medicine and medical care. We are not going to change in that area.

Liberals will be liberals. The Nation cannot exist without us. We are going to fight hard to get the school lunch program back on track so that little kids will not have to sacrifice their lunches to balance the budget.

We are going to continue to do all of those, but some amount of energy must be addressed to the revenue question. In all of this, Ways and Means will be the star. Ways and Means will be on the front stage here in the Congress and across the country.

You have already budgets of cities and States that have made drastic cuts. Large numbers of people, say in the City of New York, in my district, have told me we do not want to make these sacrifices. We think we still need these services. We think that old people should have home care because home care makes more sense than nursing homes. We think that we should still have decent meals for elderly people because that keeps them healthy and it saves money in terms of hospital care.

And we want to continue our senior citizens programs. We want to continue our programs for young children and make certain that those immunizations take place. And if that means we have to have some outreach workers to make certain that certain kinds of people get those shots, then we want to do that. We want to continue.

But we realize the city is broke. We are willing to sacrifice. We know we

have to give up something. If our city is broke, we want to be loyal and good citizens and understand.

My message to you in New York City, New York State, is, yes, we want to be understanding. We should never, never ever waste public money or private money. We should always be vigilant, and in the process of pruning the budget and making city government or State government or national government work efficiently and effectively as an eternal and ongoing process. Vigilance is necessary to make certain that every dollar that is taken in in revenue is spent wisely. That is necessary. We should do more in that area.

On the other hand, do not accept the idea, do not accept the propaganda that the city is broke automatically or the State is broke. In New York City, for example, the revenue possibilities are as great as ever.

New York City once had a City University that was completely free. No tuition was charged at all. That was during the Depression. During the Depression we had a free university; the revenue being generated was meager. But this was because the people who were in charge of the government, the decision-makers, the elected officials felt it was important, important to the people and the people in charge of the government, their families were the people who were going to those free universities.

Now it is a bit different. The power is in the hands of a different set of people, and they have imposed tuition, and they are now saying, we cannot keep going; we have to cut back. The result is that large numbers of people who qualify, students who qualify and should be in college will not be able to go to college. We do not have to make that sacrifice.

What the college professors in New York City should do is put their brains to work and talk to their students and link up with elected officials. In New York City you ought to have a discussion of creative revenue policies. What are the creative revenue policies to make us more aggressively take advantage of the fact that New York City is strategically located? It is strategically located and has a harbor, a shipping industry, is strategically located in terms of air lanes coming from Europe. There is a big volume of travel business from overseas that comes into New York City.

The city has been giving that away for decades. There is a Port of New York and New Jersey Authority. That Authority is an independent authority. That Authority pays interest on bonds. That Authority is run by people who have salaries which are twice the salaries of city officials or State officials, as most public authorities do. They do not have the same level of salaries as people who are public officials. They make decisions, often bad decisions, without any accountability to the taxpayers or the voters. And they have

been doing that for years. They have been squandering money for years.

New York City citizens could be more aggressive in taking back the source of revenues generated for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. This is just one example that we have been talking about for years, but very few people have done anything about it.

We have a Republican mayor that I disagree with on a number of other things, but he has taken the initiative and he has made it quite clear he is not going to tolerate the continued swindling of New York City by the Port Authority.

New York City has a large tourism business, in fact, probably unequaled in the country. The largest industry in the New York City is tourism. This has not come home to most people. It has been happening for the last 10 years, but they have not gotten the message. It is the second largest business in New York State.

Agriculture is still the largest industry in New York State. But in New York City, tourism is the number one industry. Why? Because New York City is strategically located, as I said before, in terms of traveling, but it has a history that interests people all over the world. It has monuments that interest people.

There are things in New York City that the world will always be interested in. Most people in their lifetimes across the whole Planet Earth would like to see New York City sometime in their lifetime, once in their lifetime. A lot of people say, I do not want to live there, but I would like to see it. And that is one of the greatest advantages. Tourism.

The fact is that New York City has a diversified population, these terrible immigrants that people talk about. We have more than anybody else. We have a greater mixture. There may be some place in the country that has certain immigrant groups that are larger, but we have the greatest mixture in New York City. We could double the tourist industry if the decision-makers in New York City, the city council and the mayor would say, we are going to take this diversity and build on it.

The fact that we have people from China, from Bangladesh, restaurants, Pakistani, Vietnam, to say nothing of all the Caribbean countries, you could have a festival in New York City every week of a different nationality or different ethnic group and promote the kind of thing that brings people into New York City in large numbers to spend their money in various ways. It is a gold mine. The diversity of New York is a gold mine.

Let me give you one example in the heart of my district on Eastern Parkway. In the heart of the 11th Congressional District we have a West Indian Labor Day parade. It has mushroomed in 20 years from a few blocks to something like 50 blocks, and it is the largest tourist event in New York City

now, 2 million people. And police always make conservative estimates; this is the police estimate.

Last Monday on Labor Day, 2 million people turned out for the West Indian parade. They do not call it a parade, it is a carnival. They set up food stands. You cannot walk, there are so many people spread along the parkway. People come from all over the world because you have people of Caribbean descent in Canada and London. They come for the carnival and parade, 2 million people.

Can you imagine how much revenue the industry receives from the impact? Those who come from outside have to have hotels. They have to travel in. All kinds of expenditures that come from the outside. Those who are on the inside spend money in great volumes for the various things that are for sale.

And the city has ways to collect this revenue, but it turns over the economy. If the city collects not a dime, the people who are selling the wares and participating in the activity are earning money in a way which generates money for the overall gross income of New York City.

Here is a tourist event started by amateurs that generates this kind of money. What if the city planned and made planning to have some kind of festive every week of the year with a different ethnic group?

And we have a City University system which has 200,000 students. This is before the budget cutbacks and the raising of tuition, but I suspect it is hovering around 195,000 students. You have 200,000 students in the City University system. This is not the State university, just the City of New York. You have all those professors.

You could have an institute for each one of the ethnic groups in the city. An institute which would help plan these things. You could have a welcoming committee for the visitors from Indonesia, Pakistan. You could have a welcoming committee organized by the city so that the activities are organized and the middle-class families of the world who are traveling, you can come to New York and expect more than just to see the sights. You can expect to be welcomed and have some of your human needs taken care of.

You take China. We have a large Chinese population in New York. The best Chinese food in the world; a politically active population.

China, with 1 billion people and growing, broken out of economic stagnation. China is creating a middle-class. If you have a billion people and 1 quarter of that billion people become middle-class, that is 250 million people. If 1 quarter of the 250 million decide to make a trip to New York once every year, we would be overwhelmed by Chinese tourists. But they are coming. It is going to happen.

You can double the revenue from tourism. You can double the economic activity from tourism in New York City if you plan for it and if you encourage it.

Every Eastern European country, you could have an exchange program. There are a thousand ways that we should take the initiative and say that we liberals and progressives are going to seize the initiative and force new activities which generate revenue.

And on the national level as well, this is a diverse Nation. Instead of bashing immigrants, we should look at what that means in terms of a tourism industry. Our initiatives in tourism are paltry as a Nation. States do a better job of encouraging tourism. But nationally, we are not in the same league with Italy and France. They know how to promote tourism. They do whatever is necessary to make certain that people come from the outside to spend their money in their countries. They have all kinds of tricks and special coupons for gasoline and all kinds of tricks, not tricks, but options, inducements, incentives.

We do not do that. We are arrogant about it all. They are going to come or not come. We will encourage a few things by sending out brochures, but revenue can be generated for the whole country if we just organize better the tourism industry.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE of Hawaii is disgusted by the fact that he cannot get an adequate response to the growth of the tourism industry. I will not dwell on that. That is just one example.

I want to bring it home to New Yorkers. Instead of despairing, you have a mayor that says the city is broke. We cannot do any more. We are going to have a different standard of living and quality of life. City University cannot only not be free, but we are going to raise the tuition so that it is going to be as high as Ivy League schools.

□ 2015

In order to have a different solution in New York City, the liberals, the progressives, have to concern themselves also with taxes and revenue as well as streamlining new priorities, setting new priorities. At the national level, the priorities are all mixed up.

Today we had a vote on the defense appropriations bill, and while this Nation needs to be investing in research and development and needs to be creating skilled workers to insure that tomorrow's highways, brainpower industries generate much of the employment in the United States, going back to Mr. Thuro's article, while we should be doing that, instead of investing in research and development and in education, we made dramatic cuts, drastic cuts in research and development and in education.

Before we went on recess, we had an appropriations bill for education, health and human services and education. Specifically, education suffered about \$3 billion in cuts. The Head Start program, for the first time in history of the program, was cut. The title I program was cut by \$1.1 billion.

It is the biggest cut. It is the biggest program. Title I is the only program

that funnels Federal funds into public schools, into elementary and secondary schools.

At a time when we need to be increasing our brainpower, improving our educational system, even the programs that exist already are drastically cut. Large numbers of job training programs were wiped out. They say they do no good and, therefore, they should be wiped out.

But we have had some weapons systems and some activities in government that have had problems that did no good. We do not wipe them out. The CIA has been in trouble for a long time. The CIA is a great embarrassment to everybody. We do not wipe it out. We insist on restructuring the CIA, get a new director, have some new codes, appoint a commission. Nobody wants to wipe out the CIA.

We do not even cut the CIA. One of the items on the floor of the House today was an amendment to cut the portion of the CIA budget which deals with satellite activities, information-gathering activities only, which is estimated to be about \$16 billion. We have to say estimate because we do not know the details of the CIA budget, of the intelligence budget. You are not allowed to do that unless you want to go to the secret room and, not a secret room, go to the room where the budget is as a Member of Congress, and behold the budget of the CIA and the other intelligence gathering activities. Once you look at it, you cannot talk about it. Nobody wants to go and look at it because they are muzzled. You cannot criticize. You are a traitor if you talk about it after you look at it. Everything is topsecret.

So estimates that are never disputed are that \$28 billion goes into total intelligence operations, a minimum of \$28 billion. In the past we have had a budget amendment on the floor to cut the CIA budget by 10 percent totally across the board, the intelligence budget. That 10 percent of \$28 billion would yield \$2.8 billion a year. We said do it for 5 years so the CIA budget is cut in half.

Today we were proposing less, just a portion of the CIA budget which deals with intelligence-gathering operations, with satellites and military aspects of it, which is estimated at \$16 billion. We were going to cut that by 10 percent. That is \$1.6 billion.

When we first introduced the amendment to cut the CIA, we got 104 votes. The second year we introduced it, we got 107 votes. Today we got less than 95 votes.

In a time when the state of the emergency is beginning to manifest itself clearer and clearer every day, at a time when it is clear that we need to devote some resources to deal with the economic emergency that we have in this country, the Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, refuse to cut a wasteful CIA budget.

Aldrich Ames and his capers have shown us something is radically wrong

with the CIA. Not only are we funding a wasteful operation, but the Aldrich Ames affair shows we are funding a dangerous operation where people are in high places, are allowed to get to high places because of a lack of accountability and standards, and an outright bum, an outright bum was allowed to rise to the top where he was directing the agents who were related to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and Aldrich Ames is responsible for the death of at least 10 agents, at least 10. He is not talking yet. He is in prison, but not fully talking. But they have admitted that he has caused the deaths of at least 10 agents.

He has received at least \$2 million from the Soviet Union. Even after the cold war ended, he was still on the payroll, and it was estimated that he was supposed to go, in the end, go to Russia, and there was a big mansion built for him. I suppose they are going to put him in the annals of history because who else has made such a fool of the American intelligence community, this man in high places who broke every rule. He was a drunk, an alcoholic. He used safe houses. We probably have beautiful safe houses that we pay a lot of money for across the world. He used safe houses for his sexual escapades.

He broke all the rules. But he was the son of a former CIA employee. He was a member of the old-boy network. So he was allowed to do this because the agency is not into anything of great significance. If it had been into some significant activity, he would have been exposed a long time ago, with Aldrich Ames's traitorous activities, with the death of 10 agents, at least they admit 10 agents dies, peace and war have not been affected at all. Nobody will say that he had any impact on peace and war in the world. Nobody will say that he had any impact on the security of the United States, because whatever those agents knew and whatever games they were playing, whatever cop-and-robber activities they were engaged in were insignificant.

Most of what Aldrich Ames was doing in getting people killed was insignificant to the welfare of the people of the United States, insignificant to the security of the United States, and yet the Democrats and Republicans both refuse to cut the CIA budget just 10 percent.

That is not the only major vote that was on the floor of the House today. There was a vote for the B-2 bomber, an amendment to strike the B-2 bomber from the appropriations bill. The B-2 bomber the President says he does not want or need. The Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "We do not want or need the B-2 bomber," that whatever functions the B-2 bomber could serve can be served in other ways that are more effective and more efficient. The chief of the Air Force says they do not need the B-2 bomber. The Secretary of Defense says, "We do not want the B-2 bomber." All of the people that we pay to

render expertise on these decisions say. "We do not want the B-2 bomber," and yet the amendment to delete the B-2 bomber on the floor of this House, despite the fact that both Republicans and Democrats supported the amendment, Republicans came over in large numbers, led by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the Republican Committee on the Budget, the man who, despite the unpopularity of it, will put his vote where his philosophy is, it still lost by 3 votes. It still lost by 3 votes; by 3 votes, the Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, said, "We want to keep a weapon that everybody says is wasteful."

Over the life of the B-2 bomber production, we are talking about \$30-some billion. Right away I think \$30 million is involved in the next year's budget over the life of it, we are talking about \$30-some billion, and yet Republicans and Democrats say "no."

What is the reason for rational people, elected by the people of the United States, to fund a weapon that the experts do not want, that the military people do not want? What is the rationale for that?

I will not answer that question. I will let you call your Congressman and ask them how they voted, and let them answer it. But it is clearly an example of how the priorities that we need to be shaping for this transitional period are not being dealt with.

We do not need any more money from taxes, either for families and individuals or corporations, until we eliminate those kinds of wasteful activities and wasteful weapons systems.

We are not living up to the promise that we made in terms of streamlining the budget. The President made it. The Democrats made it. And the Republicans made it. And yet there are tremendous examples of waste, all of which I will not go into. We will not deal with the farm program. We will not deal with the subsidies that go to the farmers in Kansas, which average between \$30,000 and \$40,000 per family, and it has been doing that for the last 20 years, and they will not cut those subsidies. Farmers are no longer the poor people that Franklin Roosevelt decided to subsidize.

Farmers are corporations now. Only 2 percent of the population lives on farms. But look at the size of the budget, between \$12 billion and \$20 billion, which go into various farm programs. We could move to seriously cut the waste and take that waste and put it into job training, education, research and development, and deal with the problems Mr. Thurow talks about. We could deal with the problems that we are in a global economy, and our greatest asset will be an educated population, a highly skilled population, a population that is fueled by economic activity that becomes more and more complex all the time but stays ahead of our competition in the rest of the world. This is the answer to the problems that Mr. Thurow lays out.

We can talk in empty terms about family values all we want, but unless we increase the wages of American families, families will continue to fall apart. Mr. Thurow says that in the modern economy all over the world, except in Japan, there is a phenomenon which has been documented all over the world, except in Japan, men are leaving their families in order to deal with the economic crisis. That is a terrible indictment of males, but males are faster to leave their families than females. Everybody knows that. Males are leaving their families all over the world in order to deal with the crisis of not having enough wages to take care of their families. They run away. When men leave their families, their individual quality of life improves because all they have to do is take care of themselves while the family's quality of life that they left behind goes down.

He points out if women start doing that, we are in real trouble. If women start to opt out and leave their children, then only the Government decides. Somebody has to take care of them. We will be in the position of having them shot down in the street like they are shot down in the street in Brazil. Orphaned children, with no homes, are often killed wholesale at night in Brazil. Their civilization has come to that.

I conclude by saying Mr. Thurow's article should be read by every Member of Congress, by every voter out there, just to get an analysis that is mainly objective. He is respected. He is not a liberal; I mean he is not an ideologue. Take a look at his facts. Take a look at his compilation of what is going on in the world and in this country and understand the economic implications.

We have to do something about the phenomenon where no country without a revolution or a military defeat and subsequent occupation has ever experienced such a sharp shift in the distributions of earnings as America has in the last generation. At no other time have median wages of American men fallen for more than two decades. Never before have a majority of American workers suffered real wage reductions while the per capita domestic product was advancing.

We are in a unique period, a transitional period. The only people who can solve this problem are members of government, the President, the Congress, the elected officials all over the country. It is our duty to bite the bullet and come up with some solutions to this drastically changing economy and society.

I hope that in the next few weeks ahead we will bear this in mind.

#### KEEPING THE PROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOEKSTRA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the opportunity to share this evening with the C-SPAN viewers and some of my fellow colleagues who I am going to introduce in just a moment. We are going to have approximately an hour colloquy here this evening.

The topic basically is we just got back to Washington yesterday. We have spent the last month in districts all over this country talking with the people that we represent.

I, for example, had a town meeting in a community, a township of Delhi, we had a town meeting in Colerain Township. I visited a number of senior citizens' centers around my district, toured factories, really to find out what it is on people's minds back in my district.

□ 2030

And it was a very, very positive response for the most part. The thing that I heard probably more than anything else is we really like the fact that you and most of the freshmen in particular, and some of the other Members that you have been working with, kept your promise. You did what you said you were going to do in the Contract With America, and they were very, very pleased that we have been doing that.

On the other hand, they have been a bit disappointed with how slow the Senate has been moving on a number of these things, so I did hear that a number of times, but they were very positive about what has been going on in the House, and there were many, many things that we talked about.

Particularly the one issue that kept coming up time and time again was the importance of balancing this budget. The people out there realize that the budget is just too large. This institution, Congress, has spent \$5 trillion more than it has brought in over the past couple of decades, and the deficit is just too, too large. The American public, people in my district, realize that. They want us to do something about that, and the message came through to me loud and clear that they believe that the answer to balancing this budget is not to raise taxes, but rather to cut spending, and I have talked to a lot of my colleagues here, and I think that is what their frame of mind is and what they believe we ought to do.

So at this point I kind of would like to introduce a couple of my colleagues that are here this evening.

First of all, let me introduce Mr. MANZULLO. He is from Illinois. And then we have a good friend of mine, Mr. JONES, who is from the State of North Carolina, and I mentioned this, I think, last time, that my mother is from North Carolina. She was born and raised in Charlotte, NC, so she always likes to hear you speak. And we also have here Mr. LEWIS from just across the Ohio River from me in the State of Kentucky. And then Mr. HAYWORTH is

going to be joining us in just a few minutes here, and is from Arizona.

So at this time, Mr. LEWIS, what do you hear back in Kentucky?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Well many of the same things that you have been hearing. My constituents are saying, "We are not concerned that you're going too far. We just don't want you to not go far enough."

And they want a balanced budget. They want to see a future for their children and their grandchildren, and I have told them that I believe with all my heart that the 104th Congress is totally committed to balancing the budget. One thing that they said that they would like to see come out of the Senate would be the balanced budget amendment that will insure that future Congresses will be committed just as much as the 104th to a balanced budget, that they would have to be. I think that is an extremely important thing because, if we go to the trouble of balancing the budget and doing those things that we have to do in order to do that, I would hate to see a future Congress come along and start running up a tremendous debt again.

But across-the-board I saw a lot of positive responses to what Congress has done already; as you mentioned, the Contract With America, that we kept our promises now that we are moving forward with doing exactly what we said we would do in balancing the budget.

I talked to my constituents about the problem with Medicare, that it would go broke in 7 years unless we do something about it, and they understood that. They want something done, they want it saved, and they want it to be secure for the future, and I think that now it is a matter of putting something together that is going to be acceptable to them and to everyone concerned.

So, I had a great response across the district, and I think that from talking to my fellow and lady Congress persons that they are receiving the same response that I did. I just think that we need to carry through now with what we have promised to do from this point on and make sure that we do save Medicare, that we do balance the budget, that we do take care of the welfare problem, that we take care of regulatory reform, that we take care of making sure that we have a strong defense.

You know, there are a lot of things that we are waiting, as you mentioned a minute ago, for the Senate to follow up on, but I think, when it is all said and done and the smoke is cleared, we are going to be there with all the promises kept.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. JONES, what are you hearing in North Carolina?

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Well, pretty much the same thing RON was talking about.

As you know, I am delighted to be reminded that your wonderful mother is from Charlotte, NC, a great city in our

State of North Carolina. I happen to have the eastern part of the State which actually I have the coastal areas. I have 19 counties, and I had the privilege to be in 15 of the 19 counties. I actually worked all but 3 days during the recess, so it gave me an opportunity to do numerous radio shows and speak in the civic clubs, speak in the senior citizens groups, church groups, and really getting out among the people to listen to the people, and, pretty much what the gentleman from Kentucky said, I found the majority of people are relatively positive about what the new Congress is doing because, as my colleague said, we are following through on our promise to the American people during the campaign, and it is a promise that we kept with the American people starting with the first 100 days in the Contract With America.

As my colleague said, the majority of comments I heard about the major issues that we are dealing with is first to balance the budget. During my presentation, it always started with what a \$4.9 trillion debt does for our children and the fact that a child born in 1995, he or she, if they live to be 75, owes \$187,000; that is their tax responsibility just to pay the interest on the debt if we do not balance the budget. So, I was very pleased to start the discussion off with the fact that we are talking about the future of our children, or maybe the lack of a future, and then I closed by talking about Medicare, wanting the people to know that we have a serious problem which was acknowledged by the Medicare trustees and that by the year 2002 the Medicare trust fund would be bankrupt.

The other side, primarily the liberals, keep saying that we keep attacking the Republicans' side, and yet I am pleased to tell you, my colleagues, tonight that the majority of people that I spoke to sincerely understand that we, the new Republican majority, are committed to preserving and protecting the Medicare trust fund for our senior citizens.

So, I can honestly tell you that, like my colleague, I was very pleased and very humbled by the confidence that the majority of people in my district feel toward this new majority that we will do what is necessary to tackle some of the most serious problems facing our Nation, trying to find a solution to those problems. So I can honestly tell you that I was well received, not just me, but this new Republican majority, and the people, we are helping to rebuild the trust that I think so many thought America had lost in elected officials because, as my colleague said, we are keeping our promise to the American people, and they know that we are very serious about trying to find solutions to very difficult problems.

So I am pleased to tell you tonight that right now I believe that the American people have more confidence in this new Republican majority than

they have had in a Congress in a long time.

Mr. CHABOT. Good to hear it. Sounds like the people in my State of Ohio are saying the same types of things that we are hearing both in Kentucky and in North Carolina.

How about in Illinois? What are you hearing?

Mr. MANZULLO. Well, everything is alive and well in Illinois. It is a magnificent district that I represent, and I think one of the most interesting things that occurred, we had a series of three town meetings. It is the district that is well served by media, and some of the Members had as many as 30 town meetings in order to get across the stretches of their congressional district, and fortunately we have an area that can be served by the media so that we can have fewer town meetings, spend more time in preparation, more time at the meetings, et cetera, and we decided to have a town meeting at one of the senior citizens high rises, retirement homes, and put on this demonstration with overheads showing, as WALTER did, that, regardless of how you look at it, there will be no money for Medicare by the year 2002.

I mean you can talk about people having to receive less, if that is the case, and people said, "Well, gee, that is going to hurt here and everything," and I said, "Well, remember this thing will be broke by the year 2002 unless we do something to really radically transform the system of Medicare," and I said, you know, as you mentioned, that in this meeting that there are somewhere between 1 and 3 million people. I am not sure of the number of former Federal employees who are still on the big FEHBP health insurance plan that most of us still have, whether you work for the Department of Agriculture or you are a Member of Congress. You can opt 1 of 30 different plans.

Mr. Speaker, I said, "Do you realize that there are seniors in this country that have health insurance in lieu of Medicare where they have prescriptive, dental, and optical coverage," and they, sort of stunned, looked at me, and they said, "Well, how is that done?"

I said, "Well, essentially what the Federal Government really does is it is a voucher, it is interjected, the private, private enterprise, into a stagnated governmental system and offering seniors more. Can you imagine that; more coverage because of the private sector?"

And I said what the Republicans are trying to do is, if you want Medicare the way it is, you do not have to do anything. You automatically are enrolled. You want to try a new plan? Come the anniversary date or the opting-in period, you get into that, and I said, you know, we are trying to experiment with ways to bring down the cost of Medicare and possibly even increase the coverage.

And so we talked about 20 minutes, and this was all seniors, and there were

only about two questions on Medicare because they registered completely, understood, what was going on and then went on to questions about our legal immigration laws. There had been a 30-minute documentary about our illegal immigration, and I left there a little bit perplexed because the people of this country underestimate the intelligence and the willingness to be part of the solution of the seniors and the seniors will not become political pawns in the hands of either party. What they really appreciate is the fact that the Republicans have taken the initiative to really delve into a highly controversial area, an area where people said what you mentioned, Medicare as the third rail of political death. That is not the case because the Republicans under the leadership of Mr. GINGRICH, who came right out and said we have got a problem, let us meet the problem head-on with the seniors of this country, let us be honest with them, let us tell them what the trustees' report is showing, that the system is going bankrupt, and let us rely upon the integrity of the seniors of this country to understand the true message, and that is what I found having crossed the district.

I tell you I am so proud of the seniors that I represent, and they are indicative of seniors across this country. I think it is absolutely remarkable how fully they comprehend the problem.

Mr. CHABOT. I think that is exactly right, and you know you brought up Medicare, and you also mentioned the trustees and the report. Maybe we should talk a little bit about that; you know, the trustees' report included three of the President's high administrative officials. There were Democrats and Republicans who studied Medicare in depth and came out with a very detailed report that said, if we do nothing about Medicare, it starts losing money next year and goes bankrupt by the year 2002, which is 7 years down the road.

□ 2045

So I think all of us here tonight and all the Republicans I have talked to, and I think in fairness some of the Democrats too, are committed to saving Medicare. It is absolutely critical to seniors, it is critical to those who will be seniors down the road, we have to save Medicare.

Now, let us be frank about this: There is a scare campaign that has been going on, we have heard it on the floor here now for some weeks and months even, where some liberals are trying to scare seniors and saying there is a plan to cut Medicare. I think, once and for all, we need to put that to rest. None of us are talking about cutting Medicare, period. We do need to save it.

What we have been doing back in the district is we have been talking to seniors and getting their ideas. One of the things I heard from seniors is that they believe there really is a lot of waste, a

lot of fraud in the system right now. People have been overcharged. Hospital bills have come through for things that they did not get the service for.

One lady gave me some horror stories, and I just happened to clip an article out of the Washington Times newspaper recently. It is a short article. I would just like to read this. I found this very interesting.

Representative JOE KNOLLENBERG, Michigan Republican.

He is a Member of Congress here,

Tells the story of a Michigan woman named Jean English, who, while going through the mail of her recently deceased brother, found a bill for his last hospital stay. Her brother, who suffered a terminal illness, died only a few days after being admitted. The bill for the four-day period came to over \$368,000.

For 4 days, \$368,000.

All of it had been forwarded to Medicare for payment. Shocked by the expense, Mrs. English called the hospital for an explanation. What she got was a 14-page itemized statement. The greatest expense? A seven-hour,

and I will repeat that,

seven-hour stay in the emergency room, according to the bill, required over \$347,000 worth of supplies.

Well, after much hemming and hawing, says Congressman KNOLLENBERG, the hospital admitted it had made a mistake. Instead of over \$347,000, the actual charge should have been \$61.30. That is right, \$61.30. An overcharge of over \$346,000. The problem was found.

End of story? No. The errant bill had been sent to Medicare and paid by Medicare. That is right, they had paid the bill.

So this is the tip of the iceberg, one example. What we need to do, one of the things I think is we need to get seniors involved in giving them an incentive to closely look at those bills and see if they are being overcharged, and perhaps give them a percentage, some kind of incentive for them to look through the bills and help us to reduce the costs which have been soaring out of control.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield for one moment, I used a chart that showed that each year there was an estimate, that each year fraud, waste and abuse amounted to \$44 billion a year charged to the Medicare Trust Fund, and that is exactly the example of what you just gave.

I did find my seniors, quite frankly, they had examples that applied to them as individuals or friends or family members. So there definitely is waste, fraud and abuse that we as the new Republican majority, we are going to deal with that problem and try to reduce and eliminate. So I appreciate your sharing that with us.

Mr. CHABOT. I believe there should be, and we have gone through and really established a criteria. The only bill that I personally would support is one, for example, that continues to allow seniors to have the choice to choose their own doctors, to make things so they would have a series of choices to make, but not to have some bureaucrat

up here in Washington telling them what their health care should be like or what doctors they should go to. I think that is important. Let seniors have a high quality of care, continue to have a high quality of care, and have them have choices.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. If the gentleman will yield, I would just like to reemphasize the fact that there is not a cut in Medicare, there is an increase in spending over the next 7 years. It will go from \$4,800 per recipient per year on average to \$6,700. That is an increase.

What we are trying to do is to hold the rate of growth to what the private sector is, approximately 6.5 percent. If Medicare continues to grow at 10, 11, 12 percent, of course it will go broke in 7 years. Slowing the rate of growth, but increasing the amount that the recipients are going to receive, and giving senior citizens a choice, as you have been talking about and as DON has been discussing, and providing money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOEKSTRA). The Chair is compelled to remind all Members that remarks in debate are properly directed to the Chair. It is not appropriate to address others in the second person or to refer to colleagues by their given names. A Member properly refers to a colleague as the gentleman or gentlewoman from Indiana, Michigan, or Ohio, or whatever State may be concerned.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important that we emphasize the fact that we keep hearing from some of those in the House that we are cutting Medicare. It is just not the case. Then we keep hearing that we are going to take from Medicare and give to the wealthy tax breaks. That just is not the case.

We are looking at allowing families that today are paying almost 40 percent of their income in taxes, average family, to give them an opportunity to have a \$500 tax credit per child per family. That does not seem like a tax break for the rich. We are looking at a capital gains tax cut that is going to be good for everyone that wants to sell a piece of property or an investment.

It just seems like that every time that we talk about anything in this House, Mr. Speaker, that we are trying to cut spending, we are trying to allow some tax credits and tax breaks for individuals and families, that it is a tax break for the rich. We have heard that from the school lunch program, from everything that we have attempted to bring the budget into balance, that the American people are asking for. It seems to me that every time we hear that, they are crying wolf on everything.

Mr. MANZULLO. If the gentleman will yield, I got into a very interesting controversy. I tend to get into those once in a while. Whenever you take an oath that you are trying to cut spending, that happens. I sit on the Committee on International Relations. We had

an opportunity to take a look at all these incredible student exchange programs. USIA carries them, about 42 different agencies carry them, over \$2.5 billion a year. In fact, I just got a request to meet with a member of the Italian Communist Party, brought over to this country, paid for by the USIA, so he can talk to American legislators about elections and democracy and things of that nature.

There has to be some good in every program, and I am itching my head, or scratching my head trying to find that one. So I had moved to the Committee on International Relations to cut out \$40 million worth of these programs. I did not get too far there. So I filed an amendment on the floor for regular debate. And goodness gracious, USIA called people back in the district.

I got a fax, one of the nastiest faxes, from a State university not located in my district, written by the woman in charge of these exchange programs, three-page fax on letterhead, "How dare you be so unkind and cruel in cutting these programs." And she went on for about two pages, and then at the end, "I am going to organize my friends and vote against you." That did not bother me. She did not live in the district anyway.

So I called the president of the university. He was not in. I talked to the assistant and got back a three-page fax from the attorney for the school. He said, "I don't see anything improper in people on our staff lobbying Members of Congress." Mind you, they are using Federal dollars if you stop to think about it, especially in her program, " \* \* \* lobbying Members of Congress. Perhaps her letter was too strong." Then he went on for two pages of his own to extol the virtues of these programs.

There is this mentality. You have heard NIMBY, not in my backyard. One is cut everybody's program except mine. I got editorialized because the newspaper back home said Mr. MANZULLO did not want to cut the Fulbright scholarships because those are popular with politicians and their kids. I moved to cut everything.

So in the end we compromised and cut out \$20 million in those programs. I got a call from the staff of International Relations, and we worked out a compromise. We saved \$20 million just like that. And yet you have to look people in the eye and say if you want to do something about this \$5 trillion national debt, which according to a chapter called Generational Forecasts that appears in the budget that says by the time every child born after 1992 enters the work force he or she will have an effective tax rate of between 84 and 94 percent, that is guaranteed socialism. It is a guaranteed collapse of our republic as we know it. We have to be stern and say this country is going to collapse unless we stop that kind of spending.

What I found is that if you tell people that, they say, "Well, but let me tell

you about this program of mine because it is an investment." You know, you can take a look at any 1 of the 10,000 programs we have in the Government, and most of them will have some good that comes out of them.

I had a young man in my office who came from Russia, an 18-year-old kid. You can tell that some day he is going to be a leader in that country. We talked for a half an hour. He had come over to this country, 1 of 6,000 students who came from the old Soviet Union, at a cost of \$30 million a year, paid by the American taxpayer.

Does the program have worth? You bet it does. But we have got to draw the line and say where does Congress have the authority to spend money we do not have?

Mr. CHABOT. If the gentleman will yield, I think that relates to something I have heard over and over at my town meetings back home, and that is that one area where people really do think there has been a tremendous amount of waste, and I agree, and that is the billions and billions of dollars that we have spent on welfare over the years. In fact, since the Great Society years, we have spent about \$5 trillion just on welfare.

I would argue and many of the people that I talked to back in the district felt this way, that most of that money was counterproductive. It encourages fathers to leave their homes and not to be home and help to raise their kids. It allows kids basically to just assume that a check will come from the Government every month, that nobody in the home ever goes to work, and the Government just supports folks. That is not the way it is; it is not helpful to those kids.

I heard over and over again that people were very pleased that we had passed a very good welfare reform package here in the House. Of course we are still waiting for the other body to act upon that.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, I am glad you brought that subject up, because in addition to balanced budget and Medicare and tax reform, and I want to touch on that in a few minutes, welfare reform, I heard that consistently in the radio shows and speaking to different groups and town meetings, that people were pleased with what the U.S. House of Representatives, led by the Republican Party, did to come out with a tough welfare reform bill, and they hoped that the other side will follow suit.

You are absolutely right that it is a tremendous problem. It has been a system that has perpetuated people being dependent on the system, instead of a system to help people get off the system and become productive citizens.

□ 2100

I appreciate the gentleman bringing that up.

Mr. CHABOT. And the thing that again I heard over and over again is that people did want to help those who

truly needed help. But they felt it ought to be temporary; it should not be a permanent way of life. Unfortunately, far too often that is what it has become, and in fact you have got generation after generation after generation of people who are receiving welfare and just never get off.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is good to be here with my colleagues this evening to discuss the matters at hand and what we learned on our summer vacation, among the constituents of our respective districts. I think it is also important, as our good friend from North Carolina pointed out, that sometimes things are misunderstood or mischaracterized.

For example, I listened with interest quite often to the gentleman down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue mischaracterize what this body has done in terms of meaningful welfare reform. Oftentimes, the President will appear on radio or television or in front of groups and point a finger of accusation at this institution, saying that this new majority is cutting off benefits to unwed teenage mothers. There is one word that the Chief Executive and indeed some of the folks who are guardians of the old order are leaving out of that characterization. And that word is, it is a four-letter word, but it can be discussed in polite company, c-a-s-h, "cash."

We do not advocate taking away benefits. We do not blame little children born into circumstances beyond their control. Indeed, as we have shown in our block grant programs and our efforts to reorganize and transform the welfare state, we are providing for women, infants, and children. But what we are trying to change are the days when someone can look to the Federal Government for what is in essence a subsidy, a cash subsidy for a way of life that abandons responsibility.

I listened with great interest to our friend from New York earlier. I believe you were touching on it just a second ago, the characterizations I believe of the economist Dr. Thurow, I believe at MIT, about some worldwide phenomenon of males leaving the household because of economic pressures.

Friends, there is no need to try and explain away via academia what is going on here as if it is some phenomenon. There are three words that describe it: abdication of responsibility. Economic pressure notwithstanding, for what is external cannot replace what is internal. If people are willing to abandon their responsibilities, and these are people at every level on the economic ladder, if people are willing to abandon their responsibilities, it creates the problem.

So we are not here to demonize one group of people or try to set Americans against each other. What we are simply saying is this: After 30 years of an expansive program whereby some estimates for every dollar we spent on so-called social spending, almost 80 cents

are eaten up by the cost of government, is there not a better way to attack the problem? Is there not a better way to have a true safety net that is a trampoline instead of a hammock?

I learned a lot in meetings with our constituents in the district. A lot of people were saying, you have got a lot more you have to get done. There is a lot more we want to see done. We sent you to Washington to make a change. Of course those same constituents acknowledge that it is very difficult in 8 to 10 months to transform a policy of highly centralized power that has taken over four decades to concentrate here in Washington.

But in addition to that, I get letters from all over the country. Indeed we have people, Mr. Speaker, as you know, who join us via C-SPAN. I got a nice note from a gentleman who is a constituent of our good friend MARK FOLEY who I believe is celebrating his 41st birthday today. He attached an item that first appeared in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1949.

Our friend from Florida sent this. It has been commonly called the ten cannots. A theologian from your State of Ohio first brought these up. They were attributed incorrectly first to Abraham Lincoln, but this is what Rev. William J.H. Bedcar said: "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. You cannot further the brotherhood of men or the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred. You cannot establish security on borrowed money. You cannot build character and courage by taking away men's initiative and independence. And, finally, you cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the viewers that the gentleman from Arizona was originally from North Carolina. We are delighted to see him in the United States Congress.

Just to point on a point that you made, and many fine points that you made, is that the concern about welfare is a concern by all Americans, no matter what race the individual is. Because they fully understand, and I heard this back to the gentleman from Ohio during my travels in my district, from all good Americans that we have a system that, again, needs serious reform for the future of this country.

I think you and the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arizona remember Bill Bennett appearing before our Republican Conference prior to the vote on welfare reform. He made a very passionate speech and told the conference that he was Catholic, he was pro-life, he was pro-family, but if

we did not deal with a very strong welfare reform bill, that our society was in deep, deep trouble.

So, again, I am pleased to add to my good friend from Arizona that we, the House, the Republican majority, join with many conservative Democrats, have passed a very, very fine, tough welfare reform bill.

Mr. CHABOT. I think something that is important to point out is that some of the folks on the other side of aisle, those that tend to be more liberal, have had a tendency to try to paint us who are in favor of changing, reforming welfare, they have tried to paint us as being coldhearted and not caring about families, children that are stuck in welfare.

I would argue that there could not be anything more damaging, more dangerous to those kids than the current welfare system which will basically encourage them to grow up in that same destructive pattern of behavior that put their parents in that system to begin with.

We are trying to change that system to get these kids out of that very destructive welfare system that we have in this country, to totally reform the system. I am very optimistic that over time we will actually be able to accomplish that. I think that is really one of the most priority issues that we have facing this country.

Another thing about welfare that has always bothered me, that does not get mentioned, I do not think, enough, is that we have to figure out where the money is going to those folks on welfare is coming from. Oftentimes the money is coming from other parents, sometimes single mothers who are working two jobs that are paying more taxes than they ought to that comes up here to Washington and then goes back down to the States, back down to the folks receiving welfare. So you are taking money away from hard working, sometimes lower middle class folks and giving it to other folks who in general ought to be working to support their own children.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Indeed, that brings up another part of the equation that is sometimes not emphasized from good people on the other side of the aisle. Indeed when my colleague from New York was here in the previous special order, I know the gentleman from Illinois listened with great interest to this, the gentleman from New York talked about a disparity of income from the very wealthy to the very poor.

And I just think it is significant to note, indeed you probably have already done this during our time together tonight, but I do not think it can be repeated enough to the American people. In 1948, the average American family of four was paying about 3 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government. By last year, the average family of four was paying almost one-quarter of its income in taxes to the Federal Government. When you combine that

with State, local taxes and the hidden taxes of regulations and fees, it is not a stretch to say that almost every family is paying almost half of its income in taxes.

So the disparity comes not so much when a check is given out but what is taken away by Government. Indeed we have this across the middle class ladder.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, one of the really disturbing things that is happening in this country, and I believe it is due to the fact that we now have had three, indeed as many as four generations on welfare, is the destruction it does literally to the souls of those children who all they know is the welfare check.

Our colleague from Florida, Congressman DAVE WELDON, during his campaign for Congress, talked to a friend of his who was interviewing three children. And he asked, what do you want to do for a living? One said, I want to be a policeman, and the other one said, I want to be a fireman. And the third child said, I want to collect checks.

I mean, I do not believe the people in this country are willing to cede personal liberty to the Federal Government in exchange for a promise of Government security.

I really do not believe that they are willing to do that. And yet what is happening is the more people get used to the fact of saying, well, let the Government do it, you know, my colleagues, let me just share with you a burden that is on my heart. I do not want to offend anybody when I do this.

When we were kids, the activities that were planned for us were done by our parents. I was raised before television. I remember the area in which we grew up in Kenrock in Rockford. It was a pretty tough area of town. On Saturday nights, my dad and some of the local merchants—dad ran a small grocery store—would take the 16 millimeter projector from the school, because the school was the community, and show movies on painters tarpaulins that were tacked to the back of billboards on the corner there. And hundreds of people, literally hundreds would show up, and we would have peanuts and popcorn. And there was a whole community together.

And my dad, who passed away about 6 years ago, said, when Americans tore the front porches off their houses, when they turned those front porches into TV rooms, the people of this country stopped talking to one another. And before we would look internally. We would look to the schools, to the churches, to each other. And when people stopped talking, they started looking to the Government for an answer.

What an incredible observation by a man who had been raised through the depression and talked about the great days, when everybody would sit on their front porches in the summertime and just throngs of people would walk down the streets, saying hello to each

other, checking up on one another, being concerned about one another's children. He said, "my dad passed away 6 years ago," he said, "America has changed and not for the better." What a sad commentary.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the challenge for us, and to the cynics who will be there, the bromide is this, oh, they want to turn the clock back. That will be the accusation that comes from the guardians of the old order who always look to concentrate power in Washington and also look askance at individual responsibility.

□ 2115

We should hasten to point out that indeed we are building a sense of community in part because of the medium of television, the fact that indeed we have a community across America watching us, that is one of the advantages. But there are many different things that change in our society. The one thing that should not be the subject of another letter I received. Folks from my district in Arizona writing and agreeing that we have to return to this document, the Constitution of the United States. This is a remarkable document. An historian characterized this in a book called the Miracle at Philadelphia, that we have this document that is here and all-encompassing and can deal with different times and different changes. So whether it was the rise of television or, as some theorists purport, the creation of centralized air-conditioning that kept government in business year round, there are changes that come to our society. But the danger for us is to ignore this document the Constitution or moreover, as the gentleman from Illinois suggests, to dismiss the notion of community. The school has become a surrogate family and not dealt with the community, I think the gentleman points that out quite correctly.

Mr. MANZULLO. The point I was trying to make is the fact that we look to government to create our community now and that is the real danger. We all do it. Good, solid, bedrock conservatives like ourselves, we think, well, why can the government not do something about it? Well, the government should be the place of last resort. Not the first place we go. It is the mentality with which we have grown up. We have to turn inwardly and try to resolve our problems.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Illinois is absolutely right, both you gentlemen and the gentleman from Ohio and that is what the last election was all about. The American people said enough government is enough. Enough taxation is enough. The gentleman from Arizona mentioned while ago, and I want to reiterate this because I do not think it can be said enough. The average working family in America will spend more on paying taxes than that same average American working family will spend on clothing, housing, and food combined. How can you hope

to achieve the American dream for your family when you have got a government that overregulates, with excessive taxation and does not give the family the opportunity to work hard and to grow and to become part of the American dream?

Everything you are saying, I agree with. The nice thing about our frustration is that the American people last November showed their frustration by changing the U.S. House of Representatives, and we have a chance to bring a brighter future and to build a better American.

Mr. CHABOT. The gentleman from Illinois mentioned that we give government too much responsibility now basically to take care of people's every needs. I read a book recently, in fact it was on the list that the Speaker gave us earlier in the year and suggested that we read, it is called the Tragedy of American Compassion. It is a relatively long book, but the interesting and boiling it down to its main point is that for many, many years basically Americans took care of each other, through charities, through churches, and then at some point in our history, and the largest portion of it occurred during the so-called Great Society years, in the 1960's with L.B.J. and folks that thought along those lines, the government basically took over, people no longer really helped their fellow Americans and people that were down and out as much. They expected that the government would do so. Welfare rolls went way up. The whole system basically has gone downhill from there. Not only has that been destructive but that helped to make the budget go out of balance. We are all paying for that huge debt in many, many ways. So this Congress is about finally trying to balance that budget.

As you gentlemen all know, we earlier this year passed the very first balanced budget resolution in the last 30 years. It puts us on a glide path to balancing this budget within the next 7 years.

Talking about what folks back in our districts were talking about and what kind of cuts we ought to make, one cut that I heard over and over again is that why are we paying so much in foreign aid? I agree with the folks that think that we have been paying far too much over the years and that is why we passed a resolution earlier this year to cut back on the amount of foreign aid that we are spending by \$21 billion over the next 7 years. It is the largest reduction in foreign aid in our Nation's history. I think that that was a proper thing for us to do. It is going to help us to balance the budget.

Something that is coming up relatively soon that I think that folks, that maybe out at C-SPAN, we ought to give them a heads-up and let them know that we are going to be facing this, because we are going to be facing perhaps, I hope it does not happen, but perhaps an impasse with the President in the near future. We are saying we

want to balance this budget, we are making what we think are the necessary cuts and this is how much we can spend and if we spend this much, we are on the glide path to balancing this budget. The President wants to spend more than we do. He wants us to add a lot of big spending back into the program. If we do that, we are not going to balance the budget. So we need very much I think to stick to our guns. That is what I heard: "Don't blink, don't back down to the President, stick to your guns, balance the budget." What have you gentlemen been hearing?

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield, you talked about the balanced budget, talking about the President and the budget we are going to submit. Is it not true, and please correct me if I am wrong, obviously we are working toward balancing the budget for the year 2002. But to get to a zero debt, a zero debt, we must balance the budget every year for the next 25 years from the year 2002 and forward for 25 years, is that not correct?

Mr. CHABOT. Yes, we also have to start paying it off. So we have to spend not only no more than we bring in. We have got to spend less than we bring in for a period of time to get rid of that debt. The debt is so large now, it is mind-boggling. Fourteen percent of every dollar that our citizens send up here in the form of taxes goes just to pay the interest on the debt. It is scary, it really is.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman would yield, the way I can put it in a way that I certainly understand with stunning clarity is in this fashion. If we do not change what is going on and if by the good fortune and act of providence we are able to keep this government running with the equivalent of chewing gum and baling wire in the years to come, my son, who is now 21 months old, over the course of his lifetime as a working adult would pay over \$180,000 just to service the debt alone, if things remained the same.

Now some good people across the country look to our friend at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and say, wait a minute, did he not come on television and agree that we need to balance the budget? Well, that statement is fairly accurate as far as it goes, but once again, the problem is in the details. The same gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue stood at that lectern 2 years ago and pledged that he would only use numbers from the Congressional Budget Office in making budget forecasts. Well, a funny thing happened in the past couple of years. I guess a young lady by the name of Rosy Scenario took up residence there in the Rose Garden because the President and his budgeteers are listening to Rosy Scenario. You notice he abandoned the CBO numbers and now has come up with a whole new set of numbers, but the funny thing is this: When you look at his 10-year plan and you use the numbers that he now pro-

vides, apart from the Congressional Budget Office numbers, they result in deficits annually in excess of \$200 billion for each of those 10 years when he purports that he has a glide path. No, that is not a glide path.

What we ask is for the President of the United States using the phraseology of our good friend CHARLES TAYLOR from North Carolina who said this last week, the President has to be the Commander in Chief, not the campaigner in chief. We all took an oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution. Let us all step up to the plate, Democrats and Republicans alike, work out the differences and agree to put this Nation on a glide path to a balanced budget in 7 years and stick to it, because as we have heard from our constituents, even that step, as modest as it is, is an important first step but it is less than what many people desire.

Mr. CHABOT. I think the gentleman's analogy about his son paying over \$180,000 in his lifetime just on the interest is an excellent analogy. Another one I think that really hits home as to how large this debt is, that if we do not do something within the next year or so, we are going to be paying more just on the interest on the debt than we do for our entire military expenditures. Just think of how much we spend on the military, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Pentagon, just think of all the ships that are out at sea, the planes, the soldiers we have, how much that costs. It is a lot of money. We are going to be spending less for all of that then we will just for the interest on the debt. It is an incredibly large amount of money. We can no longer afford to pay that because it is driving us completely bankrupt. So I think it is important.

What I heard from the folks back in Cincinnati over and over again was, "Stick to your guns, balance the budget, work with the President, there's no sense in going to war if you don't need to, but if he wants you to spend more money, don't do it. Balance the budget."

Mr. JONES. We are getting close to the end. I just want to make this statement. What I was pleased with, I have been saying this and many of you here tonight, that this whole Congress is about the next generation, not the next election. I can honestly tell you that the people in my district, the Third District of North Carolina, are pleased to know that they have men and women that are committed to doing what is right to get this Nation straight for our next generation. I am proud to be part of the ladies and gentlemen that serve in this House.

Mr. CHABOT. I would like to thank all the gentlemen, and gentleman from Arizona, the gentleman from North Carolina, and the gentleman from Illinois for being with us here this evening.

Are there any concluding remarks that any of the gentlemen would like to make at this point?

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman from Ohio would yield, just simply keep those cards and letters coming because there is a diversity of opinion, there is not unanimity, but we all recognize we have to confront these problems to make a difference not only for the next generation but for the very future of this Nation as we go into the next century.

Mr. CHABOT. I would like to thank all you gentlemen for spending your time here this evening. Again I think the message that we got loud and clear was do not back down, balance the budget, do it now.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for September 6 and 7, on account of official business.

Mr. COX of California (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 5 p.m., on account of joining his family at the launch of Space Shuttle Endeavor carrying aboard his brother-in-law, Mike Gernhardt.

Ms. MCKINNEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), on September 6 and 7, on account of business in the district.

#### 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. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TATE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBLISS, 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. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. CLAY.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. FAZIO of California.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TATE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. LAZIO of New York.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mrs. SEASTRAND.

Mr. MARTINI in two instances.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. CHAMBLISS.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material after his remarks on the Kasich amendment:)

Mr. LIVINGSTON, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DURBIN.

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. NEY.

Mr. WELLER.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 8, 1995, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1360. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Livestock Dealer Trust Act of 1995"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1361. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting CBO's sequestration update report for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1362. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred at the Florida National Guard Bureau [NGB], Camp Blanding, Starke, FL, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1363. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the annual report to Congress as required by section 203(1) of the Multifamily Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1364. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Republic of the Philippines, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1365. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance board, transmitting the Board's annual report on the low-income housing and community development activities of the Federal Home Loan Bank System for 1994, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1422a; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1366. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the annual report on the subject of retail fees and services of depository institutions, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1811 note; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1367. A letter from the Director, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the annual report on the assessment of the profitability of credit card operations of depository institutions, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1637; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1368. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the 1994 annual report of the National Credit Union Administration, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1752a(d); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1369. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the annual report on the education for homeless children and youth for the period of October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11434; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1370. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's annual report on the status and accomplishments of the Youth Gang Drug Prevention Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11806; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1371. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report regarding the implementation of the Imported Vehicle Safety Compliance Act of 1988 for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1397 note; to the Committee on Commerce.

1372. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the nondisclosure of safeguards information for the quarter ending June 30, 1995, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2167(e); to the Committee on Commerce.

1373. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-38), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1374. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-37), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1375. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Saudi Arabia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-36), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1376. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Jordan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-34), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1377. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and

Acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-35), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1378. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to the United Nations for use in Rwanda (Transmittal No. 30-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1379. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to the United Nations for use in Rwanda (Transmittal No. 33-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1380. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on control and accountability of material relating to weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet States that receive cooperative threat reduction [CTR] assistance, pursuant to Public Law 103-337, section 1204 (108 Stat. 2883); to the Committee on International Relations.

1381. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-134, "Real Property Tax Reclassification Temporary Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1382. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-135, "Canaan Baptist Church Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1383. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-136, "Interference with Medical Facilities and Health Professionals and Re-establishment of Health Services Planning and Certificate of Need Program Temporary Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1384. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-139, "Public Assistance Self-Sufficiency Program Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1385. A letter from the Employee Benefits Manager, AgriBank, transmitting the annual report disclosing the financial condition of the retirement plan for the employees of the Seventh Farm Credit District, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1386. A letter from the Federal Reserve Employee Benefits System, transmitting a copy of the annual report for the retirement plan year ending December 31, 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1387. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report entitled "Statistical Programs of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1995," pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3514(a); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1388. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Department's report on the administration of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1373(f); to the Committee on Resources.

1389. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 1992 and 1993 annual reports on the activities and operations of the Department's Public Integrity Section, Criminal

Division, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1390. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the FAA report of progress on developing and certifying the traffic alert and collision avoidance system [TCAS] for the period April through June 1995, pursuant to Public Law 100-223, section 203(b) (101 Stat. 1518); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1391. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting a copy of the updated Aviation System Capital Investment Plan [CIP], pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44501(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1392. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report of the transition to quieter airplanes, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 9308(g) (104 Stat. 1388-383); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1393. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Living Within Constraints: An Emerging Vision for High Performance Public Works"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1394. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 1206 of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 103-337, section 1206(b)(2)(A) (108 Stat. 2884); jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and National Security.

#### 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. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 215. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1594) to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans (Rept. 104-240). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 216. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-241). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### 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. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. RAHALL):  
H.R. 2274. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. POMBO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY,

Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BONO, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MICA, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. EWING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. JONES, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COX, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. LIVINGSTON);

H.R. 2275. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EWING, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WISE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. TATE, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. LATHAM);

H.R. 2276. A bill to establish the Federal Aviation Administration as an independent establishment in the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, and the Budget, 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. GEKAS (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina);

H.R. 2277. A bill to abolish the Legal Services Corporation and provide the States with money to fund qualified legal services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, and Mr. BUNN of Oregon);

H.R. 2278. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of spent nuclear fuel unless licensed facilities are in operation that have the capacity to store or dispose of all nuclear spent fuel generated by commercial nuclear reactors in the United States and from atomic energy defense activities, and to allow local port authorities to establish health and safety guidelines for safe shipment of spent nuclear fuel; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Transportation and

Infrastructure, and International Relations, 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. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KING, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRISA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LAZIO of New York, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2279. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the States of New York and Connecticut for the purpose of demonstrating methods of improving water quality in Long Island Sound; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Ms. DANNER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 2280. A bill to improve payment integrity in the Medicare and Medicaid Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, 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. DURBIN:

H.R. 2281. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H.R. 2282. A bill to modify the navigation project for the Thames River, CT, to alter the dimensions of a turning basin in Norwich, CT; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAYNE of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. JONES, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WARD, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida):

H.R. 2283. A bill to prohibit the regulation of the sale or use of tobacco or tobacco products by the Secretary of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 2284. A bill to provide incentives for the owners and operators of agricultural land to provide habitat for protected species; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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.

H.R. 2285. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of Theodore Roosevelt, to authorize the appropriation of the surcharges imposed with respect to such coins to the Secretary of the Interior for use in connection with the administration of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the conservation of endangered species; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make S corporations eligible for the rules applicable to real property subdivided for sale by noncorporate taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDER:

H. Res. 215. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1594) to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans; House Calendar No. 85. House Report No. 104-240.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 216. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1655) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; House Calendar No. 86. House Report No. 104-241.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 28: Mr. COBLE and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.  
 H.R. 263: Mr. YATES.  
 H.R. 264: Mr. YATES.  
 H.R. 387: Mr. NORWOOD.  
 H.R. 436: Mr. CHAMBLISS and Mr. LUTHER.  
 H.R. 501: Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 526: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. WHITFIELD.  
 H.R. 553: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 733: Mr. HEFNER.  
 H.R. 734: Mr. SCOTT and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
 H.R. 783: Mr. CHRISTENSEN.  
 H.R. 835: Mr. DIXON.  
 H.R. 862: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. PARKER.  
 H.R. 864: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. GREENWOOD.  
 H.R. 892: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 899: Mr. PETRI.  
 H.R. 903: Mr. KLINK.  
 H.R. 922: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. BENTSEN.  
 H.R. 963: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
 H.R. 969: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.  
 H.R. 997: Mr. BLUTE, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. MINGE.  
 H.R. 1007: Mr. COOLEY.  
 H.R. 1127: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. WOLF.  
 H.R. 1161: Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. KILDEE,

Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1178: Mr. JACOBS.  
 H.R. 1274: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 H.R. 1385: Mr. BENTSEN.  
 H.R. 1402: Mr. MFUME.  
 H.R. 1406: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. STUMP.  
 H.R. 1468: Mr. BENTSEN.  
 H.R. 1493: Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. BLILEY.  
 H.R. 1496: Ms. MOLINARI.  
 H.R. 1500: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1521: Ms. NORTON, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1533: Mr. SHADEGG.  
 H.R. 1625: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 1627: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1637: Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 1742: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1743: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. COOLEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FRAZER, and Mrs. LINCOLN.

H.R. 1833: Mr. MCCREY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 1883: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.  
 H.R. 1920: Mr. FOX, Mr. SABO, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1961: Mr. DUNCAN.  
 H.R. 1963: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KING, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1965: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MARTINI, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1987: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 2003: Mr. WALSH, Mr. SABO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2006: Mr. DAVIS and Mr. BATEMAN.  
 H.R. 2007: Mr. WOLF, Mr. DAVIS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 2137: Mrs. KELLY.  
 H.R. 2146: Mr. CRANE and Mrs. KENNELLY.  
 H.R. 2152: Mr. FOX, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2182: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 2186: Mr. PORTMAN.  
 H.R. 2194: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2205: Mr. BREWSTER and Mr. CLINGER.  
 H.R. 2219: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 2265: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BASS, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 2266: Mr. McNULTY.  
 H.R. 2273: Mrs. MORELLA and Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. SHADEGG.  
 H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. MATSUI.

H. Res. 39: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 118: Mr. RUSH and Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H. Res. 174: Mr. MINETA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 200: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SAXTON.