



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1995

No. 200

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 15, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable JAMES B. LONGLEY, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 138:

I give Thee thanks, O Lord, with my whole heart; before the gods I sing Thy praise; I bow down toward Thy holy temple and give thanks to Thy name for Thy steadfast love and Thy faithfulness; for Thou hast exalted above everything Thy name and Thy word. On the day I called, Thou didst answer me, my strength of soul Thou didst increase. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this vote will be postponed, and the vote will be taken later today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT 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.

MOTION TO AUTHORIZE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR THROUGH MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves that the Speaker may be authorized to declare recesses subject to the call of the chair through Monday, December 18, 1995.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, as many Members may know, this

procedure has never been used before, and it is my understanding that this procedure is being used to avoid a problem we may anticipate down the road in terms of our ability to later adjourn the House. I wonder if perhaps the Chair or the majority leader could enlighten us. The last time the House failed to adjourn during the last Government shutdown, Members on this side of the aisle were not notified ahead of time as to the Speaker's intentions regarding the length of the recesses called as a result. Regarding the length of recesses called, we would hope some Democratic Members who at that time ended up remaining in their offices throughout the weekend because they had not been assured in advance of notice as to when the House could come back into session would be informed, given perhaps as much as 2 days' notice as to when we may be called back into session. I wonder if the Chair or the majority leader could assure Members on both sides of the aisle that sufficient notice will be given so that we can avoid that kind of problem in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes this is a privileged motion, the Chair believes that adequate notice will be given, and the Chair will defer to the majority leader in response to the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I might respond to the gentleman from California, let me assure the gentleman from California that Members would be given ample notice before we would reconvene the body. We obviously take this measure in order for Members to be with their families later today, and tomorrow, and Sunday, insofar as it is possible to do that. Should work present itself that would be compelling enough for us to interrupt that time with their families, we will first notify the Members in ample time for them to return, and then second, of course, convene to take up that work.

□ 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

H14929

Mr. FAZIO of California. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker:

I assume we are using this device as a way of moving forward if no CR is enacted, and obviously I would hope, as I assume we all would, that some sort of continuing resolution could be put in place so that we would actually not be in a position to shut the Government down, but this device does remain available if we are not able to accomplish that. Could the gentleman give us some outstanding date or time on a given day when he would anticipate the recess coming to a close?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, of course, is free to assume whatever he likes.

Mr. Speaker, I would anticipate that what work might get done on the budget would not be done in sufficient time for us to act on it before Monday next. There is other work we can do, but it is not of such compelling urgency that we would need to schedule it for the weekend given that we can do it during the course of next week's proceedings.

So, I would anticipate that except in the extraordinary circumstance of a budget agreement that Members might prepare to go to their districts to be with their families and their constituents until Monday afternoon. We would probably try to arrange the schedule so that there would be no votes until after 5 on Monday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that assurance. I think it gives Members some confidence that even though this is a rather extraordinary, in fact perhaps unprecedented, delegation of authority, at least the Members on our side are being given, in effect by the gentleman's comments, adequate notice.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I might respond, I will have a statement, of course, later in the day so that we can have perhaps more firm revelations for Members, but in any event should the Speaker exercise his authority, Members will have certainly at least 24 hours' notice before they are called back to the Chamber.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate the gentleman's assurance.

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

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 152, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 863]

YEAS—215

Allard	Funderburk	Myers
Archer	Gillegly	Myrick
Arney	Ganske	Nethercutt
Bachus	Gekas	Neumann
Baessler	Gilchrest	Ney
Baker (LA)	Gillmor	Norwood
Ballenger	Gilman	Nussle
Barr	Goodlatte	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Goodling	Packard
Bartlett	Goss	Parker
Barton	Graham	Paxon
Bass	Greenwood	Petri
Bateman	Gunderson	Pombo
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Porter
Bilbray	Hancock	Portman
Bilirakis	Hansen	Radanovich
Blute	Hastert	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Boehner	Hayworth	Riggs
Bonilla	Hefley	Roberts
Bono	Heineman	Rogers
Brownback	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Hillery	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunn	Hobson	Roth
Bunning	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burr	Hoke	Royce
Burton	Horn	Salmon
Buyer	Hostettler	Sanford
Callahan	Houghton	Saxton
Calvert	Hunter	Scarborough
Camp	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Canady	Hyde	Schiff
Castle	Inglis	Seastrand
Chabot	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Jacobs	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Chrysler	Jones	Shuster
Clinger	Kasich	Skeen
Coble	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Coburn	Kim	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	King	Smith (TX)
Combest	Kingston	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Klug	Solomon
Crapo	Knollenberg	Souder
Creameans	Kolbe	Spence
Cubin	LaHood	Stearns
Cunningham	Largent	Stockman
Davis	Latham	Stump
Deal	LaTourrette	Talent
DeLay	Laughlin	Tate
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Tauzin
Dickey	Leach	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Duncan	Livingston	Thornberry
Dunn	LoBiondo	Tiahrt
Ehlers	Longley	Torkildsen
English	Lucas	Upton
Ensign	Manzullo	Vucanovich
Everett	Martini	Walsh
Ewing	McCollum	Wamp
Fawell	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Flanagan	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Foley	McIntosh	Weldon (PA)
Forbes	McKeon	Weller
Fowler	Metcalf	White
Fox	Meyers	Whitfield
Franks (CT)	Mica	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Molinari	Zeliff
Frisa	Moorehead	Zimmer
	Morella	

NAYS—152

Andrews	Costello	Foglietta
Baldacci	Coyne	Ford
Barcia	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Frost
Becerra	de la Garza	Furse
Bentsen	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Berman	Dicks	Gephardt
Bevill	Dingell	Geren
Bishop	Doggett	Gibbons
Borski	Dooley	Gonzalez
Boucher	Doyle	Gordon
Brewster	Durbin	Hall (TX)
Browder	Edwards	Hamilton
Brown (CA)	Engel	Hefner
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Hilliard
Brown (OH)	Evans	Holden
Clay	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Clement	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Clyburn	Fazio	(TX)
Coleman	Fields (LA)	Johnson (SD)
Condit	Filner	Johnson, E.B.
Conyers	Flake	Johnston

Kanjorski	Moran	Sawyer
Kennedy (MA)	Murtha	Schroeder
Kennedy (RI)	Neal	Scott
Kennelly	Oberstar	Serrano
Kildee	Obey	Sisisky
Klecza	Olver	Skelton
Klink	Ortiz	Slaughter
Levin	Orton	Spratt
Lewis (GA)	Owens	Stark
Lincoln	Pallone	Stenholm
Lipinski	Pastor	Studds
Lofgren	Payne (NJ)	Stupak
Lowey	Payne (VA)	Tanner
Luther	Pelosi	Taylor (MS)
Markey	Peterson (FL)	Thompson
Mascara	Peterson (MN)	Thornton
Matsui	Pickett	Thurman
McCarthy	Pomeroy	Traficant
McDermott	Poshard	Vento
McHale	Rahall	Volkmer
McKinney	Rangel	Ward
Meek	Reed	Waters
Menendez	Richardson	Watt (NC)
Miller (CA)	Rivers	Waxman
Minge	Roemer	Williams
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Wise
Moakley	Rush	Woolsey
Mollohan	Sabo	Wyden
Montgomery	Sanders	Wynn

NOT VOTING—65

Abercrombie	Green	Mfume
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Nadler
Baker (CA)	Hall (OH)	Pryce
Beilenson	Harman	Quillen
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Quinn
Bryant (TX)	Hayes	Rose
Cardin	Hinchee	Schumer
Chapman	Hoyer	Skaggs
Clayton	Jefferson	Stokes
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Tejeda
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Torres
Cox	Lantos	Torricelli
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Towns
DeFazio	Lightfoot	Velazquez
Dellums	Linder	Visclosky
Deutsch	Maloney	Waldholtz
Dixon	Manton	Walker
Doolittle	Martinez	Wilson
Dornan	McDade	Yates
Ehrlich	McInnis	Young (AK)
Emerson	McNulty	Young (FL)
Fields (TX)	Meehan	

□ 1028

Mr. MORAN and Mr. MURTHA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ENSIGN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote 863. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1747. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permanently extend and clarify malpractice coverage for health centers, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2336. An act to amend the Doug Barnard, Jr.—1996 Atlanta Centennial Olympic Games Commemorative Coin Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment

in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 927. An act to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 927) "An Act to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HELMS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. PELL, Mr. DODD, and Mr. ROBB to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1977) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2099) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes".

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 to the above entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1332. An act to clarify the application of certain Federal criminal laws to territories, possessions, and commonwealths, and for other purposes.

□ 1030

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, December 15, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the certificate of election received from the Honorable Bill Jones, Secretary of State, State of California, certifying that, according to the semi-official canvass of the Special Election held

on the December 12, the Honorable Tom Campbell was elected to the Office of Representative in Congress from the Fifteenth Congressional District of California.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE
TOM CAMPBELL, OF CALIFORNIA,
AS A MEMBER OF THE
HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Members of the California delegation please escort the Member-elect to the rostrum?

Mr. Campbell appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God?

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the Congress of the United States.

CAMPBELL STANDS FOR GOOD
GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for the State of California and for the U.S. Congress. A man of great principle, a man who is dedicated to good government and dedicated to balancing our budget and running our fiscal affairs the way they should be run in our households and in our Government and in our corporations.

It is an especially find day for me because TOM CAMPBELL has been a good friend since the first day he came to the House several sessions ago. TOM is a man that stands up for the things that he believes in, and in running his campaign, ran a clean, positive campaign. I believe his election is a notice to the American people that we are going to run positive campaigns, telling the people of the things that we believe in, and not tearing down the other side. TOM has run that kind of a campaign from the very beginning.

I am proud of you, TOM CAMPBELL. I know that you are going to be a great addition to this Congress. You performed a great duty before, and you have given our Republican delegation from California a majority for the first time in over a half a century. I hope that this is only the start, but we know that there is a job to be done; we are dedicated to doing it and, politics aside, we want to make America a better place for our children, a better place for all Americans of every race, creed, and color.

I know that you are dedicated to that proposition; I know that we will be

glad to support you in that dedication in every way that we can. Welcome to the U.S. Congress.

GRATITUDE FOR A SECOND
CHANCE

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker and my friends, this is a tremendous honor. Seldom in life do you have a second chance.

I want to begin by paying my respects to the Speaker of the House, whose leadership has created the majority that I join today.

To my family in the majority, we are a family, we will stay in the majority as long as we accommodate differences as families do, instead of striving for orthodoxy; I believe it is the strength of our party that is manifest in our ability to bring a broad spectrum to this Chamber.

To my friends in the minority party, I remember those who helped me when I was here before, when I could not get my bills through and you joined with me. To those of you who resisted the invitation to apply a label to me that was not accurate, I extend my thanks. And to those who perhaps did not resist such temptation, I have two points to raise.

First of all, it is simply wrong. It is wrong to tell an untruth to the American people. Second, it takes us away from the most important things that we should be doing and prevents us from delivering to the American people upon the propositions that we made.

I said at the start that it is seldom that you have a second chance in life. God and the voters of the 15th district have given me that chance in life once more. To those of this body who have never left office, who have been consistently, through the years, in this body, I have a little bit of wisdom to share, that when you lose this opportunity, you understand what a precious and unique privilege it is, what an honor it is to serve in the people's House.

I now have that particular wisdom that 1992 brought, me, and I hope to share it with you for many years to come. Let us use that wisdom so that we can give to our children and their children a country with a cleaner environment, with better educated children, with more individual liberty; but most importantly of all at this time in our Nation's history, a country that is not burdened by a Federal budget deficit, an end to the crime of stealing from our children so that we can spend, and the day, may it soon come, when we balance our Federal budget deficit.

Mr. Speaker, that is worth every devotion of energy that we have.

I conclude with a passage that is a favorite of mine and a favorite of my father, who died just before I was elected to Congress the first time, and you will

forgive me if I think Isaiah had something to say to me today as he does to all generations:

Though young men faint and grow weary, though youth stagger and fall, they have hope in the Lord, who shall renew their strength, and they shall rise as with the wings of eagles. They shall run and not grow weary, walk and not grow faint.

CAMPBELL WILL HELP LEAD THE WAY IN 1996

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], I liked the gentleman better under the labels they gave him in that last campaign, and I am going to speak for those conservatives who rallied around the gentleman to make sure that our victory was complete, that as the Republican Party, we are the party that allows debate and allows dissension.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] and I are friends, and became friends, and we are going to stay friends as he meets his new conservative colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Wolfe said, "You can't come home again," but they were wrong. TOM CAMPBELL, you are home again. They tried all of the campaign themes of 1996, they tried the school lunch, they tried the Medicare, and they tried to paint you what you are not, but you spell one thing to the Republican Party, TOM CAMPBELL, and that is momentum. We are winning, and just as Ron Lewis and Frank Lucas said in 1994, we are the special elections that lead the way.

TOM CAMPBELL, you are a leader in 1996. Congratulations on a tremendous victory.

APPRECIATION OF CAMPBELL'S HIGH STANDARDS

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise for this 1-minute to thank the gentleman from California [TOM CAMPBELL], actually not as a Republican, but I want to thank him as someone who knew him before he was in office, while he was in office and after he left to serve the people of the State of California. I want to thank him for putting his name on a ballot. I want to thank TOM CAMPBELL for his willingness to put his name on a ballot, once again.

As we argue over the issue differences that we clearly will have, based upon our different philosophies and, frankly, the different people that we represent, I think all of us can be proud, not just today, but frankly yesterday, that the House of Representatives is accepting as Members people of

the caliber of TOM CAMPBELL, and that hopefully, seeing right prevail will encourage more people of the caliber of TOM CAMPBELL, to put their names on the ballot. We are all better for him being a Member of this body once again.

REPUBLICAN MAJORITY IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege and honor for me to once again welcome clearly one of the most brilliant, capable, and principled individuals who has ever served in the U.S. Congress. I believe that as we look at the outcome of this very historic election, which saw TOM CAMPBELL win by a 23-point margin, it demonstrated the fact that we have the people on our side when it comes to our goal of balancing the Federal budget and ensuring that we are not going to pass on to future generations the responsibility of paying for Washington's profligate spending pattern which has gone on for over four decades.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that as we welcome TOM CAMPBELL, we should underscore the fact that his commitment to a balanced budget was key to his victory; and it is a great privilege for me, as the dean of our delegation Mr. MOORHEAD did, to underscore the fact that we now for the first time in many, many, many decades, have a Republican majority from the State of California.

□ 1045

DEALING WITH THE DEBT

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this morning our national debt stands at \$4,988,313,115,981.79.

Last month the President agreed to enact a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. But he has yet to introduce a budget that balances. We need a balanced budget for our senior citizens, working families, and our children. The Congressional Budget Office has scored his latest budget and it is not balanced. In fact in 2002 the budget deficit is projected to be \$115 billion. A balanced budget will help us reduce mortgage costs, car payments, and college costs.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the excuses to end. It is time to balance the budget, to make government live within its means and to give our children a shot at the American dream instead of the American debt.

SHUTDOWN LOOMS FOR DISTRICT

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the last day of my countdown to shutdown. This is it. This is the day. I hope that this headline is as false as the one that said that Dewey had won the election: "Midnight Likely to Bring New Shutdown."

We are close enough so that a shutdown ought to be off the table, Mr. Speaker. The GOP asked for a 7-year plan. The President put a 7-year plan on the table. Americans now want us to work on the details—grunt work, not shut down of their services.

It is unthinkable, of course, that there would be no Christmas CR for Federal employees and for those who depend upon their services. But a CR would leave the District of Columbia running on empty. The way to kill an ailing city is to dole out its own money on a 2-day or a weekly or a quarterly basis. We do not want to finish off DC. We want to revive the Nation's Capital.

Bring our bill to the floor: Bipartisan; unanimously passed in the subcommittee and the full committee that would allow the Nation's Capital to spend its own money.

Fair is fair. Help the Nation's Capital. Do not kick it while it is down.

WE MUST BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the preamble to the Constitution reads, "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

As a Republican, as a veteran, as a citizen, and as father—these are the things that I have fought for and want to pass on to my children, their children, and my country. I think many people have forgotten what this budget fight is about. It is not about the CBO or the OMB. It is about the future of this country.

If we do not balance the Federal budget and reduce spending—the country our forefathers envisioned will collapse under the weight of a massive debt and growing deficits. We must reduce spending and balance the budget. The freedom of our people and our country depend on it.

LABOR DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCES NEW PROFESSIONS

(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, whether it is a 4-year deal, 5-year deal, 7-year deal or 10-year deal, probably a 20-year deal, my question is: How can

America balance the budget on minimum wage jobs?

It is getting so bad the Department of Labor listed some new professions for Americans.

How about his: Gizzard skin remover. How about a corn cob pipe assembler? How about a brassiere cup molder cutter? That is right. If you want to hear the big one, everybody is going to school for this: How about a pantyhose crotch closer? That is right. That is a listed job.

Just think, if these jobs do not go overseas, they may even be able to move up the ladder and become a pantyhose crotch closer supervisor.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Congress has got to look at the trade deficit. You just cannot look at budget deficits and Congress don't know what they're doing in my opinion at this point.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD KEEP HIS WORD

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, there is some bad information around that Congress is going to shut down the Government. That is not true. It is not even true that the Republicans are going to shut down the Government.

It is the President. The President signed a binding agreement with Congress last month to pass a 7-year CBO-scored balanced budget in the first session of the 104th Congress. After vetoing the budget last week, the President has failed to meet his commitment. His budget does not balance.

Mr. Speaker, the President has it within his ability to keep the Government open. All he has to do is keep his promises. President Clinton should keep his word, do as he agreed and sign an honest balanced budget.

The Government is not shutting down because of the Republicans or Congress. The Government is shutting down because President Clinton will not honor his commitment to give the American people a balanced budget.

ETHICS REFORM ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish an independent Commission on Congressional Ethics. It is obvious to me as I am sure it is to you and the American people that it is time to change the way ethics complaints are handled in this House. It is time to put an end to personal friendships such as has been displayed by the current chairman, and to put an end to associations with an organization that needs to be investigated as is the case with most majority members of the Ethics Com-

mittee. The committee has acted in the case of the Speaker, but quite frankly in my opinion is too little and way too late. The independent counsel's hands should not have been tied. We cannot remove this cloud that hangs over the Capitol until a complete, independent, unfettered investigation is completed. My bill will ensure that in the future friendships between the committee and the accused will not be a part of the process. My bill calls for a commission of five former or senior Federal judges. Two would be picked by the Speaker, two by the minority leader and the fifth by the four selected. This commission would take over all duties of the current Ethics Committee. I ask my colleagues to join with me and return fairness to the ethics process. Cosponsor the Ethics Reform Act of 1995.

ALLEGED MISUSE OF ETHICS CHARGES

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just walked into the Chamber and heard the preceding speaker and he prompted me to recall that week after week, month after month, the Democrats have been trooping here on the floor and up to the press gallery to make personal charges against the Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am sick and tired of these attacks because they are frivolous solely for political advantage. These Members apparently have got nothing better to do than personally attack the Speaker of the House.

I think that every Member here ought to take note of the possibility that the ethics rules of this House of Representatives are being misused for political gain. They may be warned that ethics charges may be filed in the next year against any Member who misuses the ethics rules of this House and brings disrepute on the House of Representatives for political purposes.

PARLIMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, under the new gift ban and under the rules on limitation on outside income, is it permissible for me to collect the \$1 million I am entitled to by demonstrating that the Republicans are cutting Medicare?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

ETHICS SHOULD APPLY TO ALL MEMBERS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, there is an ad in Roll Call offering the million dollars for anyone who can demonstrate the Republicans are cutting Medicare, and I suggest there are almost 200 Democrats here who are entitled to share in that million dollars.

But I would like to respond to the last speaker on this whole issue of ethics, because of course that \$1 million pales by comparison to the \$4.5 million that was at stake with reference to the Speaker's book deal.

All this talk of partisanship, look at the nonpartisan conclusion of the House Ethics Committee, that the book deal was so bad we need a new rule with regard to books and royalties.

What is the response of the Republican leadership? Speaker GINGRICH says we need to delay it.

The chairman of the House Committee on Rules says the Ethics Committee, Republican and Democrats, and I quote, "ought to be horse whipped" if they think he is obligated to accept a new proposal to limit book royalties.

I would suggest there is bipartisan support for ethics but opine that it apply to the Speaker, also.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether it is proper for another Member to come and stand in the well while a Member is speaking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should not interrupt Members in the course of their presentations.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the Speaker.

TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(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, it was very interesting to hear my good friend from Texas get up and rant and rail against this fact. This is not a parliamentary inquiry, but this is a point of fact:

If anyone in the minority, if anyone in America can show us how going from \$4,800 this year per beneficiary for Medicare to \$7,100 in the year 2002 is a cut, come collect the check. Because the fact is the figures do not lie. Simple math tells the truth. And simple justice compels us to say to my good friend from Texas, and indeed to the American people that we should join hands and balance this budget because our children and the American people deserve no less.

Sure you can try to change the subject, but it does not change the agenda for America's future. It is time to make a difference, put this partisanship aside and build a constructive future as we confront the next century.

A MILLION-DOLLAR CLAIM

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I hope my good friend from Arizona and others will be here this afternoon when the House gives 5-minute speeches when I will display and walk the people of America step by step through and disprove Mr. Barbour's claim.

The first sentence is what I am going to disprove: "In November 1995 the U.S. House and Senate passed a balanced budget bill."

They did not. The law of this Nation says we can only allocate funds for 1 year. And the funds that are allocated for next year are projecting a \$270 billion annual operating deficit, of which \$100 billion will be stolen from the trust funds.

I again want to encourage people to pay attention to this. I am not going to ask for the money for myself. But, J.D., you can fill in the University of Southern Mississippi development fund in that space there because I will prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that this statement is false and I expect my fellow Mississippian, Mr. Barbour, to be a man of his word.

A SERIES OF FIRSTS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think there has been far too much caffeine consumed here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, in 1927 Charles Lindbergh was the first man to fly across the Atlantic. In the late 1940's Chuck Yeager was the first to break the speed of sound. In 1961 Yuri Gagarin became the first to orbit the Earth, and in 1969 Neil Armstrong became the first man to set foot on the Moon.

In 1995 Bill Clinton became the first man to veto a balanced budget since Neil Armstrong walked on the Moon. In vetoing last week's balanced budget bill, Bill Clinton said "no" to serious Medicare reform, he said "no" to serious tax relief for working families, and a brighter future for our children. Most important, he said "no" to doing the right thing, being responsible and balancing the budget, something that has not been done in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to end the charades, end the Washington style excuses, do the right thing for our grandparents, our parents, our families and our children. Balance the budget of the United States of America.

GETTING GOVERNMENT BACK IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I can understand why 215 Members of this body just voted to go on a 3-day recess. We all want to be back with our children and our wives and do some Christmas shopping and get back to a little sense of normalcy.

But things are not normal. If we do not do our job today, 300,000 Federal employees will be locked out of their jobs, the Government will be shut down, and we just voted yesterday to put our Federal Government into default in its financial obligations.

Things are not normal. We ought not go home for recess. In fact, that is why 152 Democrats voted not to. We have been told by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], that we should be prepared to stay on the job until we have done our job, until the Government is back in business.

We might rectify this situation with a continuing resolution today, legislation the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has introduced that would at least ensure that Federal employees work for their pay. But we have got to get the Government back in business and do our job before we recess or adjourn.

CHANGE FOR THE BETTER

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

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we understand that according to Senator DOLE that this event is so important that Hazel O'Leary is flying in for it. We would also like to point out that the American people asked us to make a change here and, that is, to balance the budget.

□ 1100

The Democrats have gone after the Speaker of the House with 65 charges for political reasons. Why? To take the heat off the President so that the President can go on and cook his books.

We cannot spend \$300 billion more than we take in, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is a rare find where you find a Speaker, a man or any woman that will stand up and take this abuse, take negative charges like TOM CAMPBELL did, and win. Well, the Abe Lincoln theory that you can fool some of the people some of the time stands. TOM CAMPBELL was elected, the Speaker of the House will balance the budget, do not cook the books, Mr. President. We are going to balance the budget, and my colleagues are right. We are not leaving this place. I brought my Christmas tree for here and for home. We are not leaving until we balance the budget using CBO numbers.

REPUBLICANS TAKING GOVERNMENT HOSTAGE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are here for a hostage-taking. The Republican Party wants to make very substantial reductions in what the law now provides for people who get sick, who are in economic distress. They brag on the one hand about how much they are going to reduce the rate of spending in Medicare that would otherwise occur and then bitterly denounce anyone who says they are cutting. My colleagues cannot take credit for substantially reducing Government expenditures and plausibly deny that they are cutting. They want to wipe out the legal guarantee that says, "If you are sick and elderly and in a nursing home you, will be taken care of medically." Why do they want to do this? To balance the budget? No. To increase military spending by a substantial amount.

We are going to have a defense bill on the floor today which votes billions of dollars more than even the Pentagon thinks necessary. They want to do it so they can make substantial reductions in taxes especially for wealthy people. People who make \$200,000 and \$300,000 a year will get a tax cut, and, on the other hand, people of 70 and 80 years old will see their Medicare premiums go up. Now they cannot win this on their own, so they will take the Government hostage to try to force us to go along, and it will not work.

STOP GROWING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, what the Republicans have done is to do what Mrs. Clinton asked us to do. She testified 2 years ago that if we slow the growth of Medicare down to 6, to 7, percent, we can take care of Medicare and balance the budget. We spend 7.2 percent on Medicare. It goes up 62 percent over the next 7 years.

Tax cuts. Our budget has \$245 billion in tax cuts for the American family and American business. The Democratic party criticizes us for having a tax cut for the American family. I ask, "If we gave you the money, what would you do with it? Would you put it on the deficit? No, you would spend it on the Federal budget, you would shrink the family budget."

That is not talk, that is fact, because in President Clinton's budget he reduced our tax package from 245 to 78, he took the money, and he put it on the Federal Government. He shrunk the family budget.

Stop shrinking the family budget, stop growing the Federal budget. The American public would love to have it on the deficit. They are not going to put it on the deficit. They are going to spend it up here. Spending needs to stop.

WE NEED TO HELP ORDINARY PEOPLE

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

Mr. STUPAK. The GOP balanced budget plan, as the last speaker says, give \$245 billion in tax breaks. Those tax breaks go to the wealthiest 1 percent of this country, and they repeal the alternative minimum corporate tax. Corporations do not have to pay taxes under their plan.

I would like my colleagues to listen to what my constituents say. I got a letter from a constituent from Charlevoix, MI, that says:

My wife is a bookkeeper at Charlevoix Hospital. I run a very small business in town. My wife will get a small pension from the hospital plus Social Security when she retires. I will only get Social Security. I have had 2 heart attacks, and I am a noninsulin diabetic. My wife, although working, does so while in much pain with a back ailment. With all we have to worry about in this present day, why do we have to be faced with a large group in the Congress that apparently is bent on making us suffer even more in our old age? People need help, not corporations. The wealthiest do not need tax breaks. We need to help ordinary people the middle class. Balance the budget, yes, but not on the backs of the middle class.

CLINTON SHOULD PAY PRICE FOR TRADE GIVEAWAY

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the United States of America had 100 percent of the commercial space-launch market, today we have 30 percent, and yesterday the President's trade negotiators gave away that remaining 30 percent. They signed a trade agreement with the Ukraine to allow them to launch United States satellites. Today we have the French, the Chinese, the Russians, and now the Ukrainians, putting United States satellites in orbit.

President Clinton ran as the domestic policy President committed to creating high-quality jobs for Americans. Yesterday he turned his back on thousands of working people on Florida's space coast, in California, in St. Louis, MO, in New Mexico, and Alaska, and he should pay a price for it in the election of 1996.

"FIGURES DON'T LIE, BUT LIARS FIGURE"

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, would be here and all the people that have spoken that there is not a cut in Medicare and Medicaid.

I am a senior citizen. There are cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

If there are not cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, why can we not have the tax cut unless they get the Medicare-Medicaid cuts? Unless we score the \$270 million cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, we cannot have a \$245 billion tax cut. It does not take a space scientist to figure that out.

There is an old saying in North Carolina, "figures don't lie, but liars figure."

WE WILL BE PAYING FOR BOSNIA

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the CBS radio news, a man from Tuzla was asked what it meant to him that the Americans were coming.

He shouted back in a happy, accented voice that I won't try to imitate: "Money—Only Money."

A few days earlier, I had seen the deputy major of Tuzla say on one of our national networks that he expected the Americans to rebuild their infrastructure.

At about that same time, the Bosnian leadership said they would need \$25 billion in loans from the World Bank to rebuild their country.

The biggest contributor to the World Bank: the United States of course.

This is all in addition to the \$600 million we promised in aid, up front at Dayton, and the billions we will spend on our own troops.

As long as we are there, we can keep the peace, and I think and hope with very few casualties.

But we will be borrowing billions to do it, and the American people, especially our children and grandchildren, will be paying for this for a very long time to come.

A THOUSAND-DOLLAR OFFER

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard an awful lot about Mr. Haley Barbour, the head of the Republican National Committee, and his offer of \$1 million regarding Medicare cuts. Now I would like to make an offer today to Mr. Barbour and Members of this House.

As a Democrat I am not as wealthy as some of my Republican friends, and certainly not as wealthy as the Republican National Committee, so I cannot offer \$1 million. But I will take \$1,000 out of my own savings account and offer it to any Republican Member of this House who can prove that their Medicare and Medicaid budget plan will not cut real services to senior citizens, real services to senior citizens.

My friends, that is what counts, cutting care in nursing homes, cutting care in rural health care hospitals for senior citizens. That is what the Re-

publican plan does, that is what is important, not silly little gimmicks in ads such as this.

But I will maintain my offer of \$1,000 to any Republican in this House who can suggest and prove that their plan will not cut services for our Nation's seniors.

REPUBLICAN PLAN BALANCES THE BUDGET

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, prior to November 1 was a physician taking care of Medicare patients. It is indisputable that unless we can slow the rate of growth in 6 years, there are insufficient funds to pay the bills. That will cause significant problems for those Medicare beneficiaries. As has been said already before this morning, only 2 years ago Mrs. Clinton said slowing the rate of growth to twice the rate of inflation is not a cut. That stands today as it stood then.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have presented a budget plan that balances the budget. We use honest numbers. While Republicans are busy trying to save the country from bankruptcy, there are those who are busy with political campaigns based on fearmongering and scare tactics, and it is time to get serious about our children's future, it is time to get serious about whether our senior citizens will have a Medicare plan.

Let us balance the budget now.

BUDGET SHOULD REFLECT AMERICA'S PRIORITIES

(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, to the prior speaker I say, "Take the tax break off the table, and we will have a Medicare program for seniors and we will balance the budget."

Last month Speaker GINGRICH shut down the Government because he did not like his seat on Air Force One. Now he is at it again. This time the Speaker wants his way on the budget. While President Clinton, Democrats, and Republicans in the other body all try to reach a budget agreement, the Gingrich Republicans want to shut down the Government in order to force their budget priorities on this country.

But the American people have rejected the Gingrich budget, a budget which slashes Medicare, education, environmental protection, to finance that crown jewel of the contract, tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for House Republicans to join the President, Democrats, and Republicans in the other body at the negotiating table. Let us give the American people an early Christmas present, a budget that reflects America's priorities, not Speaker GINGRICH's priorities.

FACTS AND FICTION ABOUT THE BUDGET

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, in their zeal to defend the status quo, President Clinton and his Democrat allies in the Congress have inundated Americans with a barrage of misinformation about the Republican plan to balance the budget. So let me make the distinction between Clinton fiction and the plain facts.

Fiction: The Republican plan to balance the budget cuts education. Fact: Funds for student loans rise from \$24 billion to \$36 billion, and the maximum Pell grant goes up to its highest level ever.

Fiction: Our plan cuts Medicare. Fact: Medicare spending will increase by 7.2 percent, more than double the rate of inflation, each year. That is an increase from \$4,800 to \$7,100 per beneficiary. Only in Washington would a 50-percent increase be called a cut.

Mr. Speaker, when the facts are laid out, the American people support our plan to balance the budget. Let us give them the best Christmas present ever. I say to the President, support our balanced budget.

REPUBLICANS MUST COMPROMISE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that this House just passed a Republican-sponsored motion that allows us to go into recess for 3 days with the pending shutdown of the Government once again. I fully expected this morning, maybe naively, that I would be here to vote for a continuing resolution that would let the Government continue to operate while we worked out our differences over the budget, but that is not happening.

The President said that he was willing to go ahead with what we call a clean continuing resolution. On the Senate side they said that they would agree to it. But here in the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the Republicans say that they will not, and I do not think it is fair. There is tremendous cost involved to this Government if we shut down again this coming Monday or any days following that, and the President has put forward a compromise budget that allows for a balanced budget over 7 years. It maintains the priorities, protects Medicare, protects Medicaid, protects the environment and education.

The Republicans have not done that. They made an agreement on the previous CR that they would try to come up with a compromise that protected Medicare and Medicaid and the other goals, and so far they have not. I think it is incumbent on them to do so.

CONFIDENCE, HOPE, AND GROWTH

(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, America has been blessed with many good things. We are the richest, most productive Nation ever in the recorded history of mankind.

Today, the Congress and the President are locked in a conflict over the budget. And to paraphrase the Gipper, Ronald Reagan, it is conflict not really between two parties, but between two differing visions of the future.

One is a vision of fear and limits. The Republicans vision is one of confidence, hope, and growth.

Republicans want the best for the American family. We believe our middle-class tax cuts are profamily, progrowth, and prowork.

Liberal Democrats, on the other hand, want the best for the American Government. They love higher taxes, more rules, more regulation, and bigger bureaucracies.

Mr. Speaker, this battle over the budget is not a choice between left or right, it is a choice between up or down. I, for one, want the American people to progress and for the Government to live within its means.

□ 1115

SHUT DOWN THE GOVERNMENT, SHUT DOWN CONGRESSIONAL PAYCHECKS

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Gingrich Republicans shut down the Federal Government for the longest period of time in the history of the United States. While 800,000 Federal workers were sent home with uncertainty as to whether they would be paid, the American taxpayers picked up the bill. In fact, we paid \$700 million when the Gingrich Republicans, because of their failure to pass spending bills, shut down the Federal Government. Now they are about to set another record. They are going to shut down the Federal Government for the second time in 1 year. This time they want to do it a few days before Christmas.

Just a few minutes ago, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and his Republican friends passed a motion here so we could recess and leave for 3 days. Members of Congress can go home and shop for Christmas gifts while 350,000 Federal employees are uncertain as to whether or not they are going to be on the payroll on Monday. If Members of Congress on the Republican side believe this is a matter of principle, join me and support the bill: No budget, no pay. Shut down the Government, you shut down congressional paychecks. That will end this foolishness in a hurry.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the national debt. I think we need to bring a little sobriety to this debate here today. \$4,988,313,115,981.39. As Members can see, Mr. Speaker, this debt is too big for the camera. This debt is too big for a convenient pocket-size chart. This debt, most importantly, is too big to pass on to our children. What it means to them is that in their lifetime they will have less income, they will pay higher interest rates, they will have a lower quality of life and less opportunities; but if we in the next week do the right thing and balance the budget, then in 7 years we can start paying down this horrendous number so our children can enjoy the great America that you and I believe in and work for. We did not get into this mess because of Democrats or Republicans. We have to get out of it because of both parties working together.

MEDICARE, MEDICAID, AND THE FEDERAL DEBT

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the subject of Medicaid and Medicare and to respond to the gentleman on the issue of the Federal debt. I supported a 7-year balanced budget program but, in doing so, I did not support a \$245 billion tax break that the Republican side insists on keeping in that bill while we have this huge deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the sincerity of the commitment of the Speaker and the Republican caucus in taking care of the budget deficit, but I am reminded of the cartoon, the Christmas classic, "The Grinch Who Stole Christmas." It runs every year of TV and I urge Members to take a look at it again. What they say about the grinch I think is true.

In spite of my acceptance of the sincerity on the Republican side, maybe, like the grinch, their hearts are just two sizes too small, because the decision that they are making on this budget is to reduce taxes on the wealthiest while increasing, increasing taxes on the poorest.

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, during the Bosnia debate a day or so ago, a number of Members came to the House floor to support provisions that they believe manifested the House's support for the troops: Do we support our

troops, a number of whom are going to Bosnia? The President urged us to support the troops, support the provision that was brought by the minority party, by the Democrats, to the House floor, basically validating the President's position on Bosnia.

We rejected that, but we are offering every Member of the House today, in just a few minutes, an opportunity to really support the troops. Members can support the troops by supporting the conference report on the defense authorization bill, which gives a 2.4-percent pay increase to the troops. It is a real pay increase that they can make house payments with and car payments with, and have a little better quality of life for their families. It provides more ammunition. It provides good equipment, so at least if the President puts our troops in harm's way, they will be well prepared. Please vote for this measure today.

**CORRECTING TECHNICAL ERRORS
IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 1060,
LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF
1995**

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060, to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, but I want to engage my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, in a brief discussion of how we have gotten to this point, which is probably not susceptible to a brief discussion.

As I understand it, however, we are taking up Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, which is a purely technical, typographical error correction bill to the lobbying bill, is that correct?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution directs the enrolling clerk to correct solely technical errors in the lobbying bill, especially with respect to some erroneous cross-references. It makes no substantive changes in the bill. The concurrent resolution is necessary so that the bill we send to the President, hopefully later today, will be technically correct.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time on the reservation, as has been widely reported now, there is a more substantive issue that now pertains to this bill having to do with the

contract language in section 18 and its effects on, in particular, certain health insurance organizations, corporations organized under 501(c)4. This bill does not deal with that issue, is that correct?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this concurrent resolution does not deal with any substantive issues. The Senate passed a separate resolution; actually, they amended the concurrent resolution the House had previously passed, with a change that would affect section 18 of the bill. That is not the resolution that is before the House now.

Mr. SKAGGS. Continuing to reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to consent to an amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 36 that would address what I believe to be a sincere problem with the implementation of section 18 and delay its effective date.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I cannot consent to that for two reasons. One, there are Members who have substantive objections to that particular change; and second, an amendment to the concurrent resolution at this point would only further delay this bill which has already been delayed far, far too long.

We can discuss why it has been delayed, but the point before us now is that we can end the delay. If we pass the resolution that is before us now without amendment, it will go to the enrolling clerk. The enrolling clerk will complete the enrolling clerk's duties and the bill will be available for transmission to the President. I believe that could be accomplished today. If we accepted the gentleman's amendment, I do not know how much longer this would go on.

Mr. SKAGGS. Continuing to reserve my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, that is certainly good news on the underlying issue. I was just looking to address the concern some groups have about compliance by January 1.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am certainly willing to work with Members who have an interest in section 18 on a separate bill to correct problems that may exist with it. Of course, as Members know, there is a difference of opinion of what the problem may be and the scope of the problem with section 18, but I am certainly willing to work with Members who have an interest in this, and I want to make certain that all the concerns of Members are adequately addressed in the proper forum.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope I may not cause too much difficulty with the chairman of the subcommittee for expressing my admiration on how he has dealt with this bump in the road.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, sometimes people say things they do not really mean. People often like to talk about how they hate to say "I told you so," but I have found it to be one of the few pleasures in life that gets better with age.

A few weeks ago several of us cautioned against amending this bill, let it have to go back to the U.S. Senate, and some said we were exaggerating what would happen if that were to take place. We have seen now, even when we made no substantive amendment, that the U.S. Senate was capable of entangling this bill. So I think this shows that when we urge people not to vote for amendments, we knew whereof we spoke, because there be dragons, as they said in the 15th century, and I hope now this bill is free.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask, finally, of my friend, the gentleman from Florida, who has done such good work on this bill, can we now expect the U.S. Senate will allow both the base bill, the lobbying bill, and this correction, to go to the President for signature?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, of course, this would not go to the President for signature. This just goes to give instructions to the enrolling clerk, but I am hopeful that the enrolling clerk's work can be completed today and that the bill will go to the President today. However, as the gentleman knows, I do not control the process in the Senate, but I am going to contact the Senate as soon as this action is taken today and encourage that the bill be transmitted to the President today.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield again, we all know that the gentleman does not control the processes of the Senate, because it is patently clear that no one controls what goes on in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill S. 1060, to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 6(8), strike "6" and insert "7".

(2) In section 9(7), insert "and" after the semicolon, in section 9(8), strike "; and" insert a period, and strike paragraph (9) of section 9.

(3) In section 12(c), strike "7" and insert "6".

(4) In section 15(a)(2), strike "8" and insert "7".

(5) In section 15(b)(1), strike "5(a)(2)," and in section 15(b)(2), strike "8" and insert "7".

(6) In section 24(b), strike "13, 14, 15, and 16" and insert "9, 10, 11, and 12".

(7) In section 12(b)(1), strike "7" and insert "6".

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHEDULING OF MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, AND FILING OF AMENDMENTS ON ANTITERRORISM ACT

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I had announced that the Committee on Rules would be holding a meeting of the Committee on Rules on H.R. 1710, the Antiterrorism Act. The hearing on that has been delayed until Monday at 5 p.m. There will be a meeting of the Committee on Rules this coming Monday at 5 p.m., and Members are again reminded that amendments to that legislation must be filed with the Committee on Rules no later than 4 o'clock this afternoon. That time still stands, and I would hope that Members on that side of the aisle in particular might notify their Members of the timing of those amendments being filed with our Committee on Rules.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 307 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 307

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], a member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the rule, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a rule providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1530, the fiscal 1996 Defense authorization bill. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report, as usual in this circumstance, and against its consideration, and was reported out of the Committee on Rules by a voice

vote. I urge adoption of the rule so we can get on with the debate and passage of this long-awaited most essential piece of legislation.

I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], and his outstanding staff for the tireless work they have put in this year, and especially during this very long conference, which has gone on for months now. We all know that that was not easy.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this legislation today, and the President must sign it into law, especially this President who is putting our troops over into Bosnia as we stand here right now.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, this authorization bill is the first step in restoring our defenses to the level that they should be as the world's superpower.

We all know that the defense budget has endured 10 years of cuts in a row, 10 years. Real defense spending has declined over 40 percent since 1985, and it is beginning to show in the recruitment of good young men and women throughout this country. During that time, procurement has declined an astounding 71 percent, and this must stop; and this bill does stop it.

Indeed, 2 years ago President Clinton said that we must not cut our defenses any further. That was 2 years ago. He was right then, and we are right today. Here is the bill that makes good on that pledge.

The bill for this year above the President's request, and ready to be signed over last year, so we are now turning it around. As the deployment to Bosnia takes place, as we speak, this budget should be over the President's request, because, Mr. Speaker, that mission is going to cost billions of dollars, billions of dollars which will be drained out of our appropriation for maintaining a military that can meet the demands of our strategic interests across the world.

This bill adds \$5 billion to the President's procurement request, including monies to keep open the industrial baselines for the all-important B-2 bomber and the new generation of submarines.

Mr. Speaker, our military personnel who are about to put their lives on the line in Bosnia are well taken care of in this bill. This bill provides a 2.4-percent pay raise, a 5.2-percent increase in the basic housing allowances, improved health care provisions, and many other items specifically for individual members of our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, this bill finally reverses the outrageous, outrageous attempt in 1993 when military COLA's were unfairly delayed beyond civilian COLA's. What a terrible thing that was to do to our military. I know many Members on both sides of the aisle have worked hard for this day, and I am glad to report that it is finally here. We are turning that around.

In this bill, readiness and training accounts, so critical for operational

successes, are also increased substantially. But importantly, Mr. Speaker, this bill, despite its increases, stays within the limits of the 7-year balanced budget. That is what is so terribly important. It does this substantially by reducing the nondefense items that have been weighing down this bill over the last few years, items such as foreign aid that never should have been in this bill, peacekeeping and environmental restoration that never should have been in this bill. They belong in other accounts, not in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important bill in our annual process than the defense authorization bill. That is why we formed these republic States forming this great country of ours, to provide first and foremost, above all else, for a common defense of this Nation. This is the one bill that is constitutionally mandated and benefits all of the people of this great country.

This year's bill is critical if America is to maintain its leadership role in the world, as I think it should; and as our young men and women go into Bosnia, we must give them all of the support we can, make no mistake about it. We went through a lot of votes on bills yesterday and the other day to support our troops. This is a bill that supports our troops. This gives them the wherewithal to go in with the best equipment, the best training that they possibly can, and that is what will save the lives of individual men and women serving in our military today.

So this is one Christmas present that we can give them. Come over here and vote for this rule and then vote for this bill. My colleagues will be glad they did.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule which provides for the consideration of the conference report to accompany the fiscal year 1996 Department of Defense authorization.

While there are matters contained in this conference agreement which I oppose, I will, however, support the agreement because it does address many matters of vital national security interest. I strongly support the funding made available for the B-2 Stealth bomber, and I especially support the initiatives taken by the conferees to accelerate high-priority quality of life projects for the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families. These projects are critical if we are to maintain a viable all-volunteer force, and especially so in light of the missions we have and will call upon our military personnel to perform. Finally, I am gratified that this conference report addresses the issue of core readiness and fully funds operations and maintenance accounts. Our military forces are by far the best equipped and trained in the world, but this conference report goes a long way toward assuring that they will remain so as we pass into the new century.

I would like to note, however, that the ranking members of the House National Security Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee both oppose this conference agreement. Mr. Speaker, I find it troubling that a conference lasting 98 days could ultimately report an agreement which would be opposed by both of these able legislators. And, in addition to the substantive disagreement he has with this conference report, our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], has also raised some legitimate questions about the manner in which this conference was conducted in the course of those 98 days.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the legitimate opposition to this conference agreement by both Senator NUNN and Representative DELLUMS, I urge my colleagues to support the agreement. It is late in the year and long past time that we should have sent this legislation to the President.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]. If there is one man in this body that has stood up for American troops over this last decade, it is this gentleman from San Diego, CA.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking member of the Committee on National Security and the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, for putting this package together, as late as it has been for many, many reasons, and putting some reasoned emphasis where it should go in this defense package.

First, the Bosnia debate illuminated for all of us one basic fact: We still live in a very uncertain world, and you still achieve peace through strength. Interestingly, when the whole world was looking for a way to achieve peace in Bosnia, their final resolve in Ohio was, it would take American troops with weapons to do that.

Well, if you want to support the troops, we have a bill that does it. It gives them a 2.4-percent pay increase; it increases their housing allowance by about 5.2 percent; it gives them a better quality of life; it gives them ammunition. We put about 1 billion dollars' worth of ammunition and precision-guided munitions and other munitions into this package. That means they are going to have some bullets in their guns.

It gives them a big boost in readiness. We are going to have more aircraft flying, more ships steaming. It curtails for the first time what really has been a 10-year decline in defense spending.

In the procurement accounts, and that is modernization of our platforms at sea, our ships, our sealift, our aircraft, we have been going down steadily for 10 years. We, for the first time,

start moving those accounts back up so that we can respond to two MRC's, that is two regional conflicts, at the same time, and have a better chance for our people coming home alive.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to support the troops in Bosnia, if you want to keep this country strong and maintain the United States as an international player and as still the leader of the free world, please vote for this conference report.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this time to talk about what happened on November 6 and to try and find out what is going on now. We know that on November 6, the bipartisan 50-50 Committee on Standards of Official Conduct voted 10 to 0, unanimously, to curb royalty income that any Member gets from books, and it was to start on January 1.

Now, they voted to do this because they felt that it should be limited to the outside income, because basically what people were doing when they wrote books here was the equivalent of selling their office to some extent; and so that there should be that same \$20,040 cap that is put on it.

Mr. Speaker, I think many of us here are really concerned that we are not seeing that rule of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct come to the floor, especially when it was a 50-50 unanimous agreement; 50-50, everyone agreed.

We know how partisan and how charged this place has been this year. We know the intensity of the rhetoric, but when you get that kind of an agreement and something that we thought was going to be here so that when we came back in January, all of that would be behind us, I am very troubled that it appears, and maybe this is wrong, but it appears from the Associated Press reports that the Committee on Rules does not want to move on this, that they want to have more hearings, they want to deal with it even further. They are not going to allow that unanimous Committee on Standards of Official Conduct rule to stand, and instead, the earliest we could see anything done on this would be at least March of next year and maybe later.

Mr. Speaker, I know how hard reform is, and I know how long that committee worked. I am one of the people pushing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct all year long, saying hurry, hurry, hurry, we need to get this dealt with. Now, they have dealt with it. They have done something, and they did it unanimously. I guess my real concern is why we are not seeing it on this House floor.

I see the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Rules and my friend here, and I just wanted to ask

the gentleman, is it really true that we are not going to see this come to the floor this year, as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct asked that it be brought to the floor?

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me digress just a second to remind the gentleman of when she came to the Committee on Rules, and I remember her telling me that because I was not a lawyer, I was not fit to make a decision on a particular bill coming out of the Committee on the Judiciary. I will never forget that, my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, this matter happens to be in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules, and I will assure the gentleman and everyone else that I am going to hold hearings on this the minute we come back. Right now, every ounce of strength I have and my committee has will be devoted towards getting this legislation through, getting the balanced budget in place; and in February, I will notify you to come up and testify, and we would have ample hearing time on it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my concern is, though, that I think all of us divert this to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct who have dealt with this issue almost all year long; and really my understanding was, the reason there was the unanimous, bipartisan vote was that they felt that this would be a wonderful closure, that it would come out, we could vote on this, and then January 1 this would be behind us.

If we are going to have the Committee on Rules now try and second-guess the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I mean, is the gentleman from New York saying he does not agree with what the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct did in that unanimous, bipartisan way?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say to the gentleman that in the first place, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct did not report anything to bring to this floor. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has made a recommendation to my committee that we take up the matter, and I most certainly will.

Let me tell the gentleman something else. As the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has an obligation to be fair to all of the Members of this House, we have that same obligation in the Committee on Rules, and we are going to make sure that any change of the rule is going to be fair to every single Member, all 435 of them.

There are questions about outside earned income and what kind of exemptions are presently allowed across the board and for individuals. The same thing holds true with earned income exemptions. As I have been looking at this and talking to members of the

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I find that there are numbers of exemptions that have been given to specific Members of Congress.

Now, we are going to limit the right of a Member who has developed knowledge and expertise over all of these years and who might want to write a book, and yet we are going to give specific exemptions to other people beyond all of the other limitations we have to live in. Those things, honestly and sincerely, as the gentlewoman knows, we are going to look into, and I guarantee the gentlewoman that we will be fair.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman makes an important point, in the concern with what now the delaying of the recommendations of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that people are not proceeding in regular order. This is about the rule and not about the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate must be confined to the resolution under consideration before the House.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the matter under consideration is reform presented by the Armed Services Committee. As they were explaining earlier, we are talking about the reform that is being delayed by the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules happens to be on the floor.

We cannot get a hearing on this elsewhere. The gentleman is intending to stall the proceedings.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the proper parliamentary way would be to bring to the floor this recommendation that was unanimously agreed to by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond to that as a parliamentary inquiry. Debate is confined to the matters contained in the pending resolution.

□ 1145

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. We are not allowed to discuss it on the floor and we cannot find out from the Chair how to bring it to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). The gentlewoman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry to which the Chair will respond. The gentlewoman will confine her remarks to the pending resolution.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, then, in the rest of my time I guess I will be talking about the armed services bill which will be coming up. It has some very troubling components to me.

But I must say I know how to do that. I was just very frustrated that I do not know how to discuss this other. I feel like I am constantly being gagged and we are not getting any direction. I feel that it is very important.

When it comes to the defense authorization, as you know, I have sat on that committee for 23 years. The saddest thing that is done in this bill that is coming to the floor is, we are turning our back on veterans. We are turning our back because we are not allowing those who are being dumped from the military medical system to be able to avoid having to pay the penalty of Medicare part B.

In other words, if any retiree lives in an area where their military medical system has been shut down through a hospital or whatever, so they now need Medicare part B, they are going to be fined a penalty. This House had said that that should not happen because this House and the situation had changed the rules.

We are going to hear a lot of talk today about how everybody loves the military and what they are going to do, but I must say if we keep breaking these promises and coming out here pushing these hardware-first bills, and pushing the commitments that we made to our retirees on health care and their retirement to the back of the bus and not talking about that, I am very troubled.

I am sorry if the Chair is upset with me, but I really would like to know how we discuss these reform issues, where we discuss these reform issues, and when we get to take the gags off.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, let me give the gentlewoman an idea that we brought up when we were in the minority, the discharge petition on legislation we wanted brought up that you could not bring up, that the party held down, and she is well aware of that discharge petition that we fought for. I would recommend that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, when I came here 17 years ago, I had the privilege of being placed on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I served for many years, including as ranking Republican underneath this distinguished gentleman.

He is one of the most respected Members in this body, he is a Democrat, from that side of the aisle, his name is SONNY MONTGOMERY, he is one of the greatest Members that has ever service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks, especially the chairman, for what he has said. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of this conference report.

I have great respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], my ranking member, but I strongly support this bill and I believe he will oppose it.

One area that I have worked very hard in over the years, Mr. Speaker, is working to have a strong National Guard and Reserve. We now have the total force, we are using the Reserves for the first time, and it is paying off. As we move into Bosnia, the Guard and Reserve will be totally used.

In this bill, we have a lot of things that will help the National Guard and Reserve, and the different States around the country will benefit by this bill. I certainly hope that this conference report will be adopted in the area that I have worked over the years, serving 27 years on the Armed Services and Committee on National Security, will be the Guard and Reserve have the best package they have had in 10 years.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mount Holly, NJ [Mr. SAXTON], a member of the committee.

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

I would just like to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, how much I have enjoyed working with the gentleman from Mississippi, and how much I have learned due to his friendship and the experiences that we have shared together relative to armed services matters as well as veterans matters, and how much we will all miss the gentleman, inasmuch as he has announced his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago, then-Secretary of Defense Cheney came before the Committee on Armed Services and indicated that the threat that we faced was going to change, and he was very right. But he did not say the threat that we would face would go away nor that it would be significantly diminished. If anyone has any question about that, they ought to talk to the young men and women who are today headed for Bosnia.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in the years that have gone by since Secretary Cheney made that analysis, or made that statement about his analysis, each year our capacity in terms of spending with our national security and our national defense has diminished. In fiscal year 1996, for the first time in those years, we have put a stop to that slide.

This bill, even though it is a modest military pay increase, provides for one, 2.4 percent. It provides for a modest increase in the base housing allowance of

5.2 percent. It provides for increases in readiness, and it provides for provisions to protect training and readiness accounts from raids from other unbudgeted and unintended issues.

But for the most part, I think the important parts of this have to do with quality of life, inasmuch as this bill corrects the long and festering inequality affecting military COLA's, as an example. For 2 years, military retirees have had their COLA's unfairly delayed, and this bill fixes that.

Also, I would just like to point out that this report takes a giant step toward improving the quality of life for service men and service women. The conference report contains an additional \$458 million, for example, for the military construction account which is so important for military housing.

I hope all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this support.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], another very valuable member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and this conference report. This bill keeps the promises made by the House earlier this year to begin revitalizing our national security.

This bill keeps our promises with those who serve in our Armed Forces, and ultimately with the American public. In particular, this bill contains several essential provisions for our troops; including a full pay raise and improved housing allowances. It also includes a long-overdue COLA equity provision for military retirees.

We have also taken important steps to ensure our forces receive the best training and most advanced equipment in the world.

In addition, we have taken concrete action to begin to defend our country, and our people, from the growing threat of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

All of this is done without increasing defense spending, and within a 7-year balanced budget plan, by cutting wasteful spending and reforming the Pentagon bureaucracy.

This conference report should also send a clear message to the administration that wholesale privatization of the depot maintenance system, in direct contradiction of the BRAC process and current law, will not be tolerated.

Congress has reaffirmed its commitment to a strong public depot system as imperative to our national security. Maybe this will convince the administration that no one is above the law.

I intend to work with the Air Force to develop a plan that meets the requirements outlined in this bill, that complies with the BRAC recommendations to close two Air Logistics Centers, and that ensures the remaining three depots—Ogden, Tinker and Warner-Robbins—are properly work loaded to ensure cost efficiency today and long-term stability tomorrow.

This conference report is important for our Nation and, more importantly, for our troops in the field.

I am proud of our committee's work and the leadership of Chairman SPENCE. This is the best Defense authorization bill I have worked on and I urge all Members to support it fully, and in so doing, to support our troops in this difficult time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Santa Clarita, CA [Mr. MCKEON], another member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the conference report to H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense Authorization Act.

I want to thank also my subcommittee chairman, Mr. HUNTER and the full committee chairman of the Committee on National Security, Mr. SPENCE, for their strong leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. This legislation makes great strides in all areas of defense policy and I urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, during the last few years, we have unfortunately witnessed a steady decline in defense procurement and research, which are the most critical accounts for our country's future. As several of my colleagues know, one of my foremost concerns is maintaining the production base for the B-2 Stealth bomber. Most defense experts agree that capping B-2 production at 20 aircraft is an unwise decision that will eventually cost billions when replacement are needed for B-52's and other bombers. The conference report adopts legislative language from the House bill and allows the program to continue. Since each B-2 can perform the work of several B-52's. Sustaining low-rate production will result in a leaner and more cost-efficient bomber force in the future.

Vote "yes" on the rule and the conference report to H.R. 1530.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Moultrie, GA [Mr. CHAMBLISS], another outstanding new Member of this body and a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the fiscal year 1996 authorization bill. I have been excited to see over the last several weeks the level of interest and education the Bosnian deployment has generated among Members as it relates to our military.

Bosnia has reminded Members on all committees of the importance of a military robust enough to assure that our military men and women can go about the business of protecting this Nation in the safest way possible. The bill before you does just that.

The bill also contains the critical quality of life provisions for our troops, and that will impact those who have traveled to Bosnia this Christmas. We

have assured our troops the very necessary new housing, new child care facilities, and a pay raise, all quality-of-life issues that give back to those troops we expect so much from.

The authorizing bill before you is a good piece of legislation that would not have been possible without the tireless efforts of the chairman of our Committee on National Security, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], and also my good friend, the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Support our troops, support this rule, support the authorization bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the rule. The rule certainly is noncontroversial. It is a rule that provides for 1 hour evenly divided by the Members of the majority and the minority side, so there is no controversy there.

A number of my colleagues have taken the opportunity to speak substantively to the bill, and at the appropriate point on this floor I will address a number of issues that relate to this conference report. For both procedural and substantive reasons, I will rise in opposition to this conference report, and I will also indicate that it is the intention of this administration to veto this bill and the reasons why they are desirous of vetoing and hopefully sustaining that veto.

But let me for a moment try to place a number of my colleagues' comments in some broader, hopefully thoughtful, framework.

We find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in the context of a post-cold-war environment. As I have stated on more than one occasion and will attempt to continue to repeat, I believe that this post-cold-war environment, characterized by change and transition and challenge and opportunity, is an enormous gift to us, this generation.

The post-cold-war, we can debate how it got here. Let historians do that. The practical reality is that this is where we are. I believe this moment has given us a tremendous gift, and that is the opportunity to move the world toward peace, to substantially challenge the use of force and the role of warmaking as a foreign policy instrument, the first time in our lifetimes we have a tangible opportunity to do that.

□ 1200

I believe that all of us are experiencing at this moment change and transition that is moving us from war to peace, from warmaking to peacekeeping, from risking war to risking peace. In that context let us look at this conference report.

In a period of time when we are now in a post-cold-war environment where, in my humble opinion, the threat is war itself and the challenge is peace,

we are spending as much in our military budget as the entire world combined. That in and of itself should be a shocking and illuminating notion, that the United States military budget equals the military budgets of everyone else in the world; and, second, Mr. Speaker, when we add in our allies, that is our friends, and add their military budget with our military budget, we are spending in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget, which means that slightly over 19 percent of the world's military budget is being spent by so-called potential adversaries. So we are outspending the rest of the world, The United States and our friends, 4 to 1, so this notion that in some way we are this powerless community is bizarre and absurd.

The United States became a superpower, Mr. Speaker, in the context of the cold war based upon what we had. We had mighty weapons, a nuclear triad. We had the capacity to destroy the world, so we became a mighty superpower. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the United States is to remain a superpower in the post-cold-war era, it will rely not on what we have, but rather what we do and what we stand for in the world, and in the post-cold-war environment I believe that what we do ought to be attempting to move the world to peace, and what we ought to stand for is a peaceful world moving from the bloody battlefield to the negotiating table where the issues ultimately get resolved politically, economically, and diplomatically.

So in this context this conference report adds \$7 billion over and above what the President requested, and this has happened in the midst of all the rhetoric about balancing the budget and the future of our children.

If I had to give our children and our children's children a gift, balancing the budget would not be the first priority. I would want to give my children and my children's children and their children a world at peace.

This military budget, this conference report, contains weapons of the cold war that serve no useful purpose in the context of the post cold war, and my colleagues point out that the former Secretary of Defense said yes, the nature of the threat has changed. Well, if the nature of the threat has changed, then it seems to me that our military budget needs to change in a fashion that is consistent with that changing world.

Are some of us prepared to sit here and allow our military to grow and grow so that we contemplate fighting the ultimate third world war, or, as I stated before, some who would like to paint a big sign on the Pentagon that says, Hey we only do the big ones here, or do we step back and look at the world as it really is, and the world as it really is, the Haitis, the Rwandas, the Bosnias, and the Somalias of the world, that is the future. It is not waging world war III with these big weapon systems, with more nuclear weapons

that are contemplated in this budget, with antisatellite capability that is contemplated in this budget that militarizes space.

These are yesterday's ideas, we need to move forward, and I will be more specific about what is in this conference report.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], another outstanding new Member of this body and a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding this time to me, and I want to take this opportunity to respectfully disagree with minority leader of the national security system.

When the former Soviet Union has six submarines that are going to be launched this year, when their tank lines are continuing to be in production, when they are continuing to produce MiG-29 aircraft, when they are increasing production on their SS-25 mobile launched cruise ICBM line thanks to some negotiations from the administration, there cannot be a fact that the United States is spending more than the rest of the world. There may be some differences in monetary exchange rate, but production continues for the weapons of destruction in the former U.S.S.R.

So I think that, as my colleagues know, I am a little bit disturbed that our current administration thinks this is too much money. After returning from Bosnia and stopping by and talking to the 1st Armored Division, I had hoped that all their needs were met, but what I found out is that there is a need at the company level for satellite communication systems. This is very rugged terrain, and the only way they can keep in contact with their commanders and with their protection, with the helicopter that should give them the cover they need should the need arise, they need a satellite communication system.

So this is not too much money, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker. This is a good attempt to try to provide the needs of our military, because we are asking them, in fact, to go above and beyond the call of duty. So, if we are going to do that and we are going to have troops in Bosnia, and we are, they must have everything they need, everything.

I support this rule, and I support the fiscal year 1996 authorization bill for our Defense Department.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, our ranking member, minority member, Democratic member on the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], has very eloquently pointed out to this Congress why this report should be opposed. Every day those of us in the California

delegation, and I am sure many other Members of this House of Representatives, are very proud of the service that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], has very eloquently pointed out to this Congress why this report should be opposed. Every day those of us in the California delegation, and I am sure many other Members of this House of Representatives, are very proud of the service that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] gives to the Congress and to the committee, and, as I said, he has eloquently pointed out why the bill should be opposed, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks and do so with great pride.

I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose the bill for those reasons and for one additional one. One of the worst provisions, I believe, contained in this bill is one that will lead to the immediate discharge of 1,150 service members who have HIV, the virus that causes AIDS. The provision is discriminatory, because it treats people with HIV differently from the way people with other chronic diseases are treated. The current law concerning active service of service members who are nonworldwide deployable, such as those with HIV, are sufficient. Service members become nonworldwide-deployable due to a number of medical reasons, such as diabetes, asthma, heart disease, and cancer. They still perform very significant duties, but are restricted in overseas travel to remain close to adequate medical services. The Secretary of the respective service determines when it is necessary to release a soldier from the military and when they cannot perform their duties. This policy is similar for all service members regardless of their health status.

It is inappropriate to single out HIV-positive individuals for premature separation from the armed services and in doing so treat those individuals differently than the military treats other healthy productive members with chronic illnesses. Current military policy has been in place since the Reagan administration and received the support of many senior military officials. The Department of Defense opposes this provision. I hope that our colleagues will join them and do so as well.

I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose the fiscal year 1996 Department of Defense authorization bill conference report. There are many reasons to defeat this conference report. One of the worst provisions contained in this bill, supported by Mr. DORNAN, will lead to the immediate discharge of the 1,150 service members who have HIV, the virus that causes AIDS.

The Department of Defense opposes the Dornan provision (section 561) of the House fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization bill and does not believe that service members with HIV present a deployability problem. The DOD believes that members with HIV should be treated as any other service member with a chronic, possibly fatal, medical condition and

remain on active duty until such time as they cannot perform their duties.

This provision is discriminatory because it treats people with HIV differently from the way people with other chronic diseases are treated. The current laws concerning the active service of service members who are nonworldwide deployable, such as those with HIV, are sufficient. Service members become nonworldwide deployable due to a number of medical reasons, such as diabetes, asthma, heart disease, cancer, and pregnancy. They still perform very significant duties but are restricted in overseas travel to remain close to adequate medical services. The Secretary of the respective service determines when it is necessary to release a soldier from the military as they cannot perform their duties. This policy is similar for all service members, regardless of their health status. It is inappropriate to single out HIV-positive individuals for premature separation from the armed services and in so doing, treat these individuals differently than the military treats other healthy productive members with chronic illnesses.

The current DOD policy was initiated and supported by both Reagan and Bush DOD officials. Current military policy has been in place since the Reagan administration and received the support of senior military officials. The policy is the product of serious analysis and deliberation by the Pentagon of the impact of HIV-positive individuals on military readiness. The Clinton administration has only moved to continue these policies, demonstrating bipartisan support for this approach.

The presence of HIV infected service members in the military does not adversely affect its combat readiness or efficiency. These troops are still physical healthy are valuable to the armed services. The training and experience of these service members positively adds to the military and should not be taken away as long as they can still perform their duties. These duties must be performed and service members with experience of both overseas and domestic operations would be more qualified to handle a wider variety of duties.

The number of service members who are infected with HIV are a small segment of the military. Service members who are HIV-positive are less than one-tenth of one percent of the entire Armed Forces. This small group of people obviously is not affecting the combat readiness of the whole military.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the conference report.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], another great American.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, of course I rise in support of yet another superb Jerry Solomon Republican rule, crafted beautifully, but I also rise in support of the authorization bill that Captain FLOYD SPENCE and his five saddle-wear weary marshals, his subcommittee chairmen, have hammered out over the last year. It is precisely the authorization bill that the American people want.

If we had one of these futuristic national referendums with a hologram where every taxpayer put his hand on a TV screen and voted on this authorization bill, I think it would win by over 75 to 80 percent.

I will submit for the RECORD my floor statement coming up during the authorization bill and about 30 excellent points, and there are probably 200 or 300, of why this should be enacted into law and signed by Mr. Clinton.

I am going to spend a few precious hours at the Feast of the Nativity with our fighting men in Bosnia. Believe me, they are going to ask me what happened to the authorization bill with everything in it for them.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a Defense authorization bill that lives up to the commitment for a strong national defense presented in the Republican Contract With America. The military personnel provisions within the bill are at the heart of what makes the bill a national security legislative milestone highlighting the differences between the President and the Congress on defense issues.

In response to troubling revelations suggesting that the readiness of our units and the quality of life for our service members and their families were approaching dangerous levels, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel responded to address the needs of service members and make readiness a top priority.

Before we get into quality of life and readiness issues, let me assure the over 300 cosponsor of H.R. 2664, the bill from Mr. YOUNG of Florida, that this conference report includes a provision that restores equity to the payment of cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] to military retirees.

QUALITY OF LIFE

The bill attacks quality of life problems directly by supporting the President's request for a 2.4 percent pay raise and a series of other enhancements to compensation, including a housing allowance increase that was 35 percent larger than the President's. The bill also protects members from increased out-of-pocket costs by guaranteeing housing allowance payments so long as the member remains committed to a mortgage or rent payment at a location.

READINESS

Readiness of our forces was the motivation for language to terminate the dramatic drawdown that eliminated over 630,000 people from the Armed Forces. The provision establishes permanent end strength levels that preserve at least some elements capability necessary to carry out the Nation's two major regional contingency defense strategy.

In terms of our reserve forces, the bill provides increased numbers of full-time military technicians to support deployable units and establishes income protection and dental insurance programs to increase the readiness of individual reservists.

The bill also corrects the insult of military prisoners continuing to receive their pay while serving extended jail sentences. In addition, the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to centralize the oversight and policy responsibility at the Department of Defense level and establish a rigorous process to account for persons missing in action. This is an issue of immense personal interest to me that is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a powerful statement in support of our men and women in uniform, to include those currently deployed and those soon to be deployed to the former Yugoslavia. For this and the many other aspects of this bill that will make our Armed Forces better, I

strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1996 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Republicans restore defense spending after Clinton cuts combat readiness:

President Bill Clinton has more than doubled the defense cuts promised by candidate Clinton—\$120 billion.

Clinton's defense plan—the "Bottom Up Review"—should be called the "Bottom Out Plan." It is underfunded by as much as \$150 billion.

Republicans, under the leadership of FLOYD SPENCE, have restored just \$7 billion in defense, including programs I personally helped initiate such as: Additional funding for Army scout helicopters and both the OH-58D Kiowa Warrior RAH-66 Comanche; additional funding to build more than 20 B-2 bombers and equip the B-1B with precision guided munitions; and additional funding for a near-term ballistic missile defense capability using existing Navy Aegis cruisers and destroyers.

My Subcommittee on Personnel, thanks to the efforts of my ranking Democrat, OWEN PICKETT, and the hard work of all my subcommittee members, improved military quality of life by: Increasing military housing allowance by 35 percent; setting permanent personnel levels to stop the drawdown; and increasing the number of national guard technicians.

I also included several initiatives that reverse the trend of liberal social programs within the department designed to conduct combat operations. This bill stops abortions at U.S. military hospitals; stops pay for convicted military prisoners; establishes strict new guidelines for the accountability of American prisoners of war and missing in action; discharges all nondeployable HIV military personnel; and awards the AFEM to United States veterans of El Salvador.

In closing, I would remind those who oppose this bill of the wise words of one of our Founding Fathers, Benjamin Franklin, who warned: "The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it."

Support our troops, support modernization, support this conference report.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

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

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, the military personnel provisions in this conference report respond to many of the challenges that confronted the Committee on National Security, and specifically the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, at the beginning of the year. As always, the primary objective of the subcommittee was to provide for the welfare of the superb men and women who serve our country in uniform and to enhance the quality of life for them and their families. I believe this conference report achieves that objective.

It achieves the objective for military retirees by restoring equity in the payment of cost-of-living adjustments—a welcome solution for retirees that is long overdue.

The bill confirms the President's request for a much needed 2.4-percent pay increase, and provides a 5.2-percent increase in housing allowances—a full 1.8-percent more than that requested by the President.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the two very major issues, I just mentioned, there are numerous other provisions of similar import to meet the needs of all the services, both active and reserve, across the full spectrum of personnel issues. For example, the bill provides continuing authorities for numerous programs that are critical to the effective operation of the Armed Forces. One such program is the Navy's temporary promotion program so important to nuclear safety at sea.

The bill provides a number of new authorities requested by the Secretary of Defense such as an income replacement insurance program for reservists who are called to active duty and housing benefits for senior NCO's assigned to sea duty.

The bill provides guidance and policy changes needed by the Department of Defense to ensure success on programs such as the joint officer management program designed to develop and educate military leaders for the future.

The bill corrects prior mistakes such as repealing the requirement to restructure the athletic programs at our service academies.

Although many of these provisions are relatively limited in their impact and low cost, you can be sure they are very important to the people they affect. Even the smallest issue is an important piece of the carefully woven tapestry that comprises our Nation's military personnel policy. I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], one of the outstanding women of this Congress.

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support the rule and the fiscal year 1996 DOD authorization conference report.

This bill provides \$264.7 billion for Defense—an urgently needed increase of some \$7 billion. It enhances the quality of life of our troops by providing \$458 million more for family housing, child care, and medical facilities, and it raises military pay by 2.4 percent. It adds funds for readiness and the recapitalization of our forces, addressing the significant shortfall between the force structure prescribed by the President and his budget plans. And it implements important reforms in acquisition policy, reducing procurement costs.

This bill also contains important, sensible directives for the Secretary of Defense on depot policy, which has been a matter of great concern to many in this body. I urge the Secretary to consider these provisions carefully.

Finally, I want to thank Chairman SPENCE and all the rest of the committee and staff who labored so intensively on this excellent bill. I urge adoption of the rule and the bill.

□ 1215

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than gold-plated Santa Claus present for some of the most egregious examples of wasteful military spending that we can find in our Nation's military budget. Meanwhile, it provides basically coal for our troops, it provides coal for anyone that is seriously concerned about a violation of the ABM treaty.

If we are serious about negotiating with the Russians to be able to get rid of the military threat of missiles aimed at the United States that can destroy this society, why would we possibly go about a direct threat to the Russian security by violating the ABM treaty, which is exactly what this program does?

By building 100 or more interceptors that violate the ABM, we force the Russians into a situation where they themselves are back into an arms race. This makes no sense politically. With the stroke of a pen, we can begin to eliminate the very missiles that you care supposed to be concerned about, but instead we intend ourselves to go and find a way to reenter and reopen the arms race.

Mr. Speaker, we are spending \$7 billion more than the military requested. We are out building B-2 airplanes, F-22 airplanes, *Seawolf* submarines. The list goes on and on and on. Why do we have to spend more than the military requires? Why did Members jam President Clinton into accepting these additional subsidies for our military defense in order that he could take his position on trying to provide peace to Bosnia?

This is blackmail, it is shortsighted, and it will hurt the overall security of the United States of America. Security means not only do we defend ourselves against foreign threats, it means whether or not we invest in the future of this country. This military budget expends dollars that should be better spent on the education of our children, on fighting crime, on fighting the war on drugs. Those are the priorities of this country, and those are not the priorities of this Republican-led Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Authorization Agreement is a terrible piece of legislation. It can be faulted on many counts; more, in fact, than I can concentrate on in a 2 minute speech. So let me mention three.

I oppose funding for the B-2 bomber. The Pentagon doesn't want it. We shouldn't fund it. It is a cold war relic that the United States no longer needs. We already have 20 bombers coming, and an additional commitment to \$31.5 billion is not in anyone's future budget plans.

I oppose funding for the F-22. The F-22 was designed to operate against high tech So-

viet fighters that have not been built and are going to be built. With the cost of \$74 billion, this budget buster is a high tech luxury we cannot afford.

We could restore 63 percent of the Medicaid cuts by eliminating these two weapons alone.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most alarming provision in this bill is the requirement for a national missile defense system which violates the terms of the ABM treaty.

The agreement would unnecessarily require deployment by 2003 of a costly national missile defense system capable of defending the United States from a long range missile threat that the administration and the intelligence community do not believe will materialize.

The agreement implicitly requires a national missile defense system architecture with multiple sites and in excess of 100 missile interceptors that cannot be accommodated within the terms of the ABM treaty as now written.

The Russian Government signaled to the Bush administration that if the United States does not adhere to the terms of the existing ABM treaty, it would threaten continued Russian implementation of the Start I Treaty and would put at risk Russian ratification of the Start II Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, beginning this week Russia is supposed to start ratifying Start II. If they sense an act of the U.S. Congress that would result in abrogating U.S. responsibilities of the ABM Treaty, they will not ratify Start II.

Russia's cooperation on ABM is linked to United States compliance of the ABM Treaty. If the United States does not adhere to the ABM agreement, and subsequently the Russians do not ratify Start II, we could conceivably trigger a new, far more costly arms race which no country can afford.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thought this was one of the best bills ever to come before this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Clarendon, TX [Mr. THORBERRY], an outstanding member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. THORBERRY. Mr. Speaker, what some people have yet and may never understand is that you cannot provide security with pieces of paper, you can only provide security with strength, and this bill does make us stronger. With young American service men and women moving to Bosnia today, every Member has a responsibility to support them. But we have to support them with more than just speeches and fancy resolutions. I think we have to support them by voting for this bill, which does support them with a pay increase and a 5.2-percent increase in the housing allowance.

This bill supports them by beginning to address our critical modernization needs, where we are sending kids out to fight with equipment that is older than they are. It supports them and those who have served before by fixing the COLA and equity problem, and it also pushes the development of new weapons which will not only be more effective against the enemy, but safer for our soldiers to use, and thereby further protect their lives.

To truly support our troops with more than just words, Members should

vote for this bill, and the President should sign it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, as a former member of this committee, I want to speak a little bit about priorities. I think that this bill that will be before us shows that, unfortunately, our priorities have slipped. Right now we are taking pregnant women and children out of the safety net for Medicaid, and yet we are increasing cold war weaponry, giving the military \$7 billion more than they asked for, while the children and the mothers of this Nation will go colder, less health care, hungrier.

I want to quote from a prayer written by the great child advocate, Marian Wright Edelman. In it she says:

"Oh, God, forgive our rich Nation, which thinks security rests in missiles rather than in mothers, and in bombs rather than in babies."

I would say, Mr. Speaker, the American people believe more in mothers and babies than in missiles and bombs. This Congress is wrong with this bill.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS], a great Member of this body.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1530, the 1996 National Defense Authorization Act.

This bill will make the military a better place for our service men and women—and their families.

It includes a 2.4-percent pay raise, and better housing for our troops and their loved ones at places like Fort Knox, in Kentucky's 2d district.

It creates a new program to make military housing dollars go even further by increasing cooperation with the private sector.

And it fixes COLA dates so that military retirees have the same benefits as Federal civilian retirees. I think our retired service men and women deserve at least that, Mr. Speaker.

Most important, it sends a solid message of this Congress' support for our troops—some of whom will soon be in Bosnia. I wish that weren't so, Mr. Speaker. But I am happy we can do this for them.

I congratulate Chairman SPENCE for his leadership.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, when I first came here 17 or 18 years ago, there was a gentleman on that side of the aisle, he was a Democrat, his name was Walter Jones. He was a fine southern gentleman, a good Congressman. He is no longer with us, but there is another WALTER JONES with us, his son, from Farmville, NC.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments about my father.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the national defense authorization

conference report. This bill acts upon the promise this House made to our military and the American people with our Contract With America. It begins addressing the growing shortfalls in our national defense, it improves the quality of life for our military personnel while sustaining core military readiness. It contains enough of the central provisions and benefits, such as a full pay raise, improving housing allowances, and essential medical benefits. It highlights the importance of the military reserves and provides for their increased participation.

For our military, there are just as many threats and needs in the world today as ever before. With this bill, we are meeting the needs of our military while balancing the budget. We need to support the rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Danvers, MA [Mr. TORKILDSEN], another member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the conference committee, FLOYD SPENCE deserves great credit for his hard work and skill in bringing to this House a successful report. His guidance and leadership were instrumental in this arduous, often contentious process.

Just days ago, this body debated the President's constitutional role as Commander in Chief in deploying United States troops to Bosnia. Today, we are here to exercise Congress' constitutional authority to raise and support the Armed Forces of the United States.

It is startling that, while this conference report provides a 2.4-percent pay raise, increases family housing, improves health care for military dependents, and funds overdue COLA equity for military retirees, the President has threatened a veto.

Whatever objections the President or my colleagues may have to provisions contained in this conference report, I would ask that they consider them in context of a soldier and his or her family, once again being separated during the holiday season. Members of our Armed Forces who are deployed into war-torn Bosnia should be free from concern about the well-being of their families back home.

This conference report cuts \$2.6 billion from the House-passed bill, but still funds programs critical to readiness, modernization and quality of life for our troops. This measure puts forth a strong vision for our national security apparatus in the post-cold-war world, while balancing the budget.

I ask that my colleagues support the rule, support the Defense conference report, and support our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], another Member that is going to be leaving this body next year and will not seek reelection. He is a very fine Member of the body, even though we have some differences over a thing called dairy.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, if this authorization bill would mandate that every member of the military drank three gallons of milk a day, we would not have a problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize that there are many good things in this bill, but I want to plead with my colleagues to beware of something that was not debated on the House side because we thought it was going to be solved in the Senate, and if the President vetoes this bill, I think it becomes essential that we deal with it a second time around.

This bill, unfortunately, includes a provision that any member of the military who is determined through testing to be HIV-positive is automatically dismissed. That is a serious public policy and public health problem that should not become law in this country.

I want everyone to understand that I have been working very closely with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] on our side, and others, to mandate testing of infants as part of Ryan White, because we have treatment that is available, and if testing leads to treatment and to cure, we ought to be for it. I want to encourage testing for every element of American society, because testing is the most important element we have for prevention. But when mandatory testing leads to mandatory job discrimination, we are sending a signal in America society to everyone not to get tested.

Today it is the military, tomorrow it will be military contractors, and the next day it will be all of the independent private sector. We have to change that provision before this bill becomes law.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say once again that under the Constitution of the United States of America, the most important thing we can do is to provide for the common defense of this Nation. That is what this bill does. But also something a little bit more than that.

Mr. Speaker, today we have problems in our society, but one of the most honorable careers that anyone could ever have is a career with the United States military. Today, when we depend on an all voluntary military, we take people from all walks of life. We offer them the career. When they come, if they come out of the ghettos or if they come out of the rural areas like I represent, when they go in the military they learn things that are so terribly, terribly important. First of all, they are offered \$30,000 toward a college education. Many of them would never have that opportunity if they did not join the military.

They learn other things. They learn things like pride; they even get a little religion in the military. They learn

things like how not to use drugs. It is so important to our youth today. But if we are going to ask these young men and women to come out of the areas where they are and to serve their countrymen, then we have to provide the very best for them.

I will never forget, when we went into Desert Storm and we faced one of the largest armies in the entire world, and yet we came out of there with so few casualties. Why? Because those young men and women were the best trained, the best equipped young men and women that have ever served in this military. They had state-of-the-art equipment. For instance, they had equipment that allowed them to see the enemy when the enemy could not see them. That saved lives.

That is what this is all about today. When we look at this bill before us, it provides for procurement, it provides for state-of-the-art weaponry and machinery and equipment that these young men and women need. That is why this bill is so terribly important. Come over here, vote for this rule, and then vote for the bill. It is the best thing Members can do today.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 29, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 864]

YEAS—378

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Clement
Allard	Bono	Clinger
Andrews	Borski	Clyburn
Archer	Boucher	Coble
Armey	Brewster	Coburn
Bachus	Browder	Coleman
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Collins (GA)
Baker (CA)	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Baker (LA)	Brownback	Combest
Baldacci	Bryant (TN)	Condit
Ballenger	Bryant (TX)	Cooley
Barcia	Bunn	Costello
Barr	Bunning	Coyne
Barrett (NE)	Burr	Cramer
Bartlett	Burton	Crane
Barton	Buyer	Crapo
Bass	Callahan	Creameans
Bateman	Calvert	Cubin
Bellenson	Camp	Cunningham
Bentsen	Campbell	Danner
Bereuter	Canady	Davis
Berman	Cardin	de la Garza
Bevill	Castle	Deal
Bilbray	Chabot	DeLauro
Bilirakis	Chambliss	DeLay
Bishop	Chapman	Dellums
Bliley	Chenoweth	Diaz-Balart
Blute	Christensen	Dickey
Boehlert	Chrysler	Dicks
Boehner	Clay	Dingell

Dixon	Johnson, E. B.	Portman
Doggett	Johnson, Sam	Poshard
Dooley	Johnston	Rodanovich
Doolittle	Jones	Rahall
Dornan	Kanjorski	Ramstad
Doyle	Kaptur	Reed
Dreier	Kasich	Regula
Duncan	Kelly	Richardson
Dunn	Kennedy (MA)	Riggs
Edwards	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
Ehlers	Kennelly	Roberts
Ehrlich	Kildee	Roemer
Emerson	Kim	Rogers
Engel	King	Rohrabacher
English	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Ensign	Klecza	Rose
Eshoo	Klink	Roth
Evans	Klug	Roukema
Everett	Knollenberg	Royce
Ewing	Kolbe	Sabo
Farr	LaFalce	Salmon
Fattah	LaHood	Sanders
Fawell	Lantos	Sanford
Fazio	Largent	Sawyer
Fields (LA)	Latham	Saxton
Fields (TX)	LaTourette	Scarborough
Filner	Laughlin	Schaefer
Flake	Lazio	Schiff
Flanagan	Leach	Scott
Foglietta	Levin	Seastrand
Foley	Lewis (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Ford	Lincoln	Shaw
Fowler	Linder	Shays
Fox	Lipinski	Shuster
Franks (CT)	Livingston	Sisisky
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Skaggs
Frelinghuysen	Longley	Skeen
Frist	Lowey	Skelton
Funderburk	Lucas	Slaughter
Furse	Manton	Smith (MI)
Galleghy	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Ganske	Martinez	Smith (TX)
Gejdenson	Martini	Smith (WA)
Gekas	Mascara	Solomon
Gephardt	Matsui	Souder
Geren	McCarthy	Spence
Gibbons	McCollum	Spratt
Gilchrest	McCrery	Stearns
Gillmor	McDade	Stenholm
Gilman	McHale	Stockman
Gonzalez	McHugh	Studds
Goodlatte	McIntosh	Stump
Goodling	McKeon	Stupak
Gordon	McKinney	Talent
Goss	McNulty	Tanner
Green	Meehan	Tate
Greenwood	Meek	Tauzin
Gutknecht	Menendez	Taylor (MS)
Hall (OH)	Metcalf	Taylor (NC)
Hall (TX)	Meyers	Tejeda
Hamilton	Mica	Thomas
Hancock	Miller (FL)	Thompson
Hansen	Minge	Thornberry
Harman	Mink	Thornton
Hastert	Moakley	Thurman
Hastings (FL)	Molinari	Tiaht
Hastings (WA)	Mollohan	Torkildsen
Hayworth	Montgomery	Torres
Hefley	Moorhead	Traficant
Hefner	Morella	Upton
Heineman	Murtha	Vento
Herger	Myers	Volkmer
Hilleary	Myrick	Vucanovich
Hilliard	Nethercutt	Waldholtz
Hinchey	Neumann	Walker
Hobson	Ney	Walsh
Hoekstra	Norwood	Wamp
Hoke	Nussle	Ward
Holden	Oberstar	Watts (OK)
Horn	Obey	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Ortiz	Weldon (PA)
Houghton	Orton	Weller
Hoyer	Oxley	White
Hunter	Packard	Whitfield
Hutchinson	Pallone	Wicker
Hyde	Parker	Williams
Inglis	Pastor	Wilson
Istook	Paxon	Wise
Jackson (IL)	Payne (VA)	Wolf
Jackson-Lee	Peterson (FL)	Woolsey
(TX)	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Jacobs	Petri	Young (AK)
Jefferson	Pickett	Zeliff
Johnson (CT)	Pombo	Zimmer
Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy	
	Porter	

NAYS—29

Barrett (WI)	Maloney	Rangel
Becerra	Markey	Royal-Allard
Brown (OH)	McDermott	Rush
Conyers	Mfume	Schroeder
DeFazio	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Durbin	Neal	Stark
Frank (MA)	Olver	Watt (NC)
Guderson	Owens	Wyden
Lofgren	Payne (NJ)	Yates
Luther	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman	Lewis (CA)	Stokes
Bonior	Lightfoot	Torricelli
Clayton	McInnis	Towns
Collins (IL)	Moran	Velazquez
Cox	Nadler	Vislosky
Deutsch	Pryce	Waters
Graham	Quillen	Waxman
Gutierrez	Quinn	Young (FL)
Hayes	Schumer	

□ 1249

Messrs. RUSH, OLVER, and LUTHER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CHAPMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 863 and "no" on rollcall 864.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 307, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1530), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 307, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 13, 1995, at page H14378.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I bring this conference report on the fiscal year 1996 defense authorization bill before the House with a great sense of satisfaction. At the beginning of this year, the Committee on National Security set out to craft a defense bill that would achieve four fundamental goals. Through the course of committee, House and conference action, we never lost sight of these objectives.

First, we promised to improve the quality of life for our military personnel and their families. A number of critically important provisions in this bill, such as a 2.4-percent pay raise, enhanced housing allowances and medical benefits, COLA equity for military retirees and increased funding for family housing and barracks, are a testament to our trying to keep our eye on the ball and looking out for the people who serve in our Armed Forces.

Lately we have heard much discussion about the importance of supporting our troops. I can think of no better way to put our money where our mouths are, when it comes to a tangible expression of support, than passing this bill. Nor can I think of a better Christmas present than beginning to reduce the growth in out-of-pocket expenses being incurred by military personnel and their families by passing this bill.

Second, we promised to sustain short- and long-term readiness. This bill increases funding for critical readiness accounts more than \$1.6 billion over the President's request, while putting a halt to the debilitating practice of diverting needed training and operating funds to pay for unbudgeted humanitarian and peacekeeping operations.

Third, we set out to begin addressing the growing modernization shortfalls that have resulted from a decade-long 70 percent real decline in procurement spending. This bill puts an end to the procurement holiday and helps to shore up a dramatically downsized industrial base by adding funds to a number of underfunded and unfunded programs.

Our military leaders have just recently requested that we not wait for modernization as suggested by the administration.

Fourth, we set out to initiate a number of important and long overdue structural and process reforms in the Pentagon. This bill contains the most forward-leaning package of acquisition reforms in decades, as well as reductions in an oversized Pentagon staff and acquisition work force. The bill also begins the process of privatizing a number of the Pentagon's support functions in pursuit of a greater cost effectiveness and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that promises were made and promises are being kept.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the product of the tireless effort on the part of all committee members. In particular, however, it is the product of the committees, subcommittee and panel chairmen, along with their distinguished ranking members who support this conference report.

It is these Members in particular who deserve the lion's share of the credit for all that is positive in this bill. However, I do personally want to recognize Chairman HUNTER, Chairman WELDON, Chairman BATEMAN, Chairman HEFLEY, Chairman DORNAN, and Chairman MCHUGH for their dedication, commit-

ment, and perseverance. Their expertise and competence have made my job, all of our jobs, much easier.

And also the ranking members of those subcommittees. In the end, this was a bipartisan bill. Out of committee, with only three dissenting votes. Off the House floor, out of the conference, and I hope will be on final passage this afternoon.

I would also be remiss if I failed to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. CLINGER, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for his herculean efforts all year long on the issue of acquisition reform. More than any other single Member on either side of the aisle, BILL CLINGER is responsible for the comprehensive reforms to our Government's obsolete and inefficient procurement system contained in this bill.

I also want to stop right here and thank the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for his efforts.

Finally, I want to express my thanks to the entire staff of the Committee on National Security. Despite a 20-percent cutback in the committee staff following last year's election, we are nearing the end of one of the busiest years I can remember, having served here for 25 years. The Committee on National Security staff is hardworking, dedicated, and professional. Their commitment to public service, which is all too often underappreciated and overlooked, is exemplary.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. I do so for reasons that are both procedural as well as substantive. I will not take up the time of the body on the procedural issues, though I think they are awesome. This will be the product of a discussion between the minority and majority Members confined to the dynamics of the committee, and I will not raise these issues on the floor. Rather, I would now turn to the substantive reasons of disagreement with the content of the conference report.

First, Mr. Speaker, I believe this conference report represents a return to the cold-war-era defense budget. In particular, weapons programs that are inappropriate in this post-cold-war era are funded. In so doing, the authorization measure fails to make the additional legitimate savings afforded by the significant geopolitical changes we have experienced to date.

□ 1300

Moreover, it fails to fund sufficiently operations and maintenance accounts that must in turn fund the real requirements of the new era, peacekeeping and humanitarian operations, while also maintaining the training programs required to keep our military ready for its traditional missions.

Let me now respond to specific concerns.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the ballistic missile defense program, the bill would require the deployment of a national missile defense system by the year 2003. It envisions a multisite system of more than 100 interceptors provisioned for early upgrade to a space-based weapons component. Such a system would constitute unilateral abrogation of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, referred to as the ABM treaty. This unnecessary abrogation of the ABM treaty would give the Russian Government reason to withdraw their support for START II, as they have said they would, if we go forward with unilateral abrogation. This would likely ruin our best chances for retaining strategic stability at reduced, manageable, and less-expensive levels.

Antisatellite program, the ASAT, the bill includes \$30 million to resurrect the previously terminated ASAT program. This puts the United States in the position of explicitly militarizing space. Now we had terminated this program. Why, for any rhyme or reason, would we want to resurrect this monstrosity of the cold war is a mystery to this gentleman.

With respect to the B-2 bomber, the bill provides for \$493 million over the President's request for this program. Worse, the bill repeals, Mr. Speaker, the cost and quantity caps in current law for the existing program. This would clear the way for 20 additional B-2 bombers which the Air Force neither wants nor needs.

With respect to the Cooperative Threat Reduction [CTR] Program, the bill restrains CTR in ways that may impede the most effective program of dismantling the Russian nuclear weapons complex and infrastructure.

With respect to submarines, the bill envisions—listen to this, Mr. Speaker—a noncompetitive construction of four one-of-a-kind prototype submarines before determining what the successor to the current *Seawolf* should be. It would also buy a third *Seawolf* to tide over the industrial base in the interim, and in this gentleman's opinion this is a costly and ineffective way to determine future submarine requirements.

With respect to budget policy, overall the bill adds some \$5.2 billion above the administration request for procurement and resorted to what we call split or incremental funding to finance a third *Seawolf* and the DDG-51 destroyer program. Many of the additional spending requirements will bring with them funding tails that would require increased budgets or cuts of other programs to sustain in the future. Adds in the ballistic missile defense, the B-2, and the shipbuilding programs are among the most significant future budget drivers.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any program, and I do not like to use the term pork, and I rarely, if we go back in the RECORD, rarely have used that term, but if there is a piece of legislation

that took care of people as opposed to addressing the reality-oriented national security needs of this country, this bill does it. We bring forward several ships all the way into the year 2000 back to 1996 to be funded now. This is not a way to handle the fiduciary responsibilities of the American taxpayer.

With respect to HIV, Mr. Speaker, the bill would require the discharge of members of the Armed Forces who have the HIV-1 virus. This is unnecessary and discriminatory. The military has stated that this is not a problem as they are able to discharge personnel when necessary under current law. It would preclude the military from utilizing military personnel who are completely functional in their jobs and in whom the military has invested significant training resources.

With respect to abortion, the bill would amend permanent law to include the restrictions on the use of Department of Defense facilities for abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger. This conservative agenda issue was incorporated in the bill without one single hearing.

On the subject with respect to the environment, in a departure from advances made over the past 2 years environmental programs are underfunded.

With respect to command and control, this provision governing the operation of U.S. troops during peacekeeping operations impinges upon the role of the President as Commander in Chief in a manner that may very well be unconstitutional.

With respect to contingency operations, while the bill provides for funding of unbudgeted contingency operations, it contains a provision that would require the President to submit a supplemental appropriation which may be an unconstitutional direction to the President. We have often done this in report language. This now is in bill form, a very different approach.

With respect to nuclear weapons, the bill would authorize the needless expenditure of resources to maintain and expand the Department of Energy nuclear weapons infrastructure in advance of the programmatic environmental impact statement that is being produced on infrastructure requirements.

On nuclear testing, the bill needlessly prepares for future nuclear weapon testing.

The technology reinvestment program, the bill terminates this successful program, only provides \$195 million to complete pending projects.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the above reasons it should come as no surprise that the President has indicated, and I have a copy of the letter for my colleagues' perusal, statement of administration policy from OMB, that the President has indicated that he will veto this bill in its present form.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report and allow

members of the conference to readdress these issues, bringing forth a bill that can be supported by both Congress and the administration.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], who is going to be retiring this year. I know of no one in this body, and I have been here 25 years, who has been more supportive of the military than SONNY MONTGOMERY. He is known throughout the world as the supporter of the military, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to let him have 2 minutes at this time.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the chairman for those very, very kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

The bill is a very good bill, and especially to the National Guard and Reserve. In fact, General Baca, who is head of the National Guard, says his advisers tell him that this is the best bill in 10 years for the Air National Guard and for the Army National Guard.

We have included in this bill an addition of \$770 million for new equipment for the reserves of the different services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a point I would like to make here very strongly: When we give money to the National Guard and Reserve, we have every State in the Union and a lot of small communities will get these funds. It will not go to the big bases, but it will go to all of the communities around the country.

The technicians for the Guard and Reserve were raised by 1,400 persons. We also were able to extend—this is very important also—we were able to extend the current 15 days of military leave for technicians by an additional 44 days to reflect the increased reliance upon these personnel. In the Bosnia operation, Air Guardsmen and Air Reservists lose part of their pay unless this law is changed.

The Youth Challenge Program to help our young men and women around the country is extended for another 18 months.

The National Guard can still do community service if it is tied to the training of our different units in the country.

Let me say instead of cutting each fighter squadron to 12 in the Air National Guard and Air Reserve the bill provides for 15 aircraft in each squadron instead of 12 to 15.

The bill includes the program we offered to buy down interest rates for service personnel at military bases. This is a good test program to let the young soldiers buy homes under the veterans' programs, and I certainly rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill when it passed the House. I thought then that the parts of it I found problematic might be scrubbed out in conference, but it still comes from conference with some problems and, I think, still can be resolved. So, in the hope that it might be put through the scrubber one more time I will vote against the conference report today.

Mr. problem, by and large, with the bill is the same problem I have with the appropriation bill. Though I voted for it, I think it is the worst problem in the bill because I do not think that either bill is realistic about the future. I think we have a mismatch between defense plans and defense budget, and I think this conference report adds to the problem.

My colleagues see between fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 2002 the Republican budget calls for a national defense spending budget authority to increase from \$265 billion in 1996 to \$280 billion, going up about \$15 billion or in increments of about \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year. That is going to be a hard line to toe in a budget that takes discretionary spending from \$548 billion down to \$513 billion in 2002.

During this same 7-year period, the Clinton budget allocates \$20 billion less to defense. This too will be a tough path to follow; it will call for a lot of tradeoffs; but in the last 2 years, the Clinton budget is more realistic than the Republican budget about funding for national defense. In 2001 and 2002, the Clinton budget actually allocates \$15 billion more to defense than the Republican budget.

What happens in this Republican budget is a truncation in those out-years to squeeze it into their plan to balance the budget by the year 2002. The Clinton budget, on the other hand, realistically recognizes that in those out-years systems like the F-22 are going to be coming to fruition, and it rises to accommodate the cost of these systems. Despite their austerity, this truncation in the out-years, this Republican budget in the short term, this bill, is loaded down with more systems, four prototype submarines, two DDG destroyers, up to 20 B-2 bombers, new systems like space-based lasers, ASAT. The Navy's Upper-Tier system has risen from being just a testing prototype system to being a full up core TMD system. Mandated IOC's, a practice we have rarely done, but here we have mandated an initial operational capability date for missile defense system, for theater missile defense system, for Lower-Tier, Upper-Tier, for PAC-3, and we speeded up the milestones for Brilliant eyes.

This is not a budget that looks toward an austerity period coming ahead of us. It only raises the risk of a train

wreck down the path, and I do not think it can be accomplished in the long run on the spending track that is laid down in the overall Republican budget.

Let me just speak a minute to BMD, ballistic missile defense, because I happen to know something about that.

□ 1315

This budget contains a \$450 million plus-up for national missile defense. The mandated IODC or deployment date is 2003. I am basically supportive of that. If we deployed just at Grand Forks this is realistic, but it will still add \$3 billion to the budget that we are working on because of the deployment date. However, if we deployed at several sites, which this report anticipates, then the cost goes up and it goes up astronomically, about \$5 billion a site. Though it is in this budget, it is nowhere provided for in the overall budget.

Mr. Speaker, buried in this conference report also is a \$50 million plus-up for space-based chemical lasers. That is not terribly objectionable by itself, but tagged onto it is a mandate for an on-orbit test of a demonstration system by the end of 1999. That is not far away. This seemingly innocuous direction, added to the report without any discussion in conference to my knowledge, carriers with it a price tag that would easily run to \$1 billion. That is low-balling the estimate. That is why I say this conference report needs another scrub in order to make it realistic within the budget we pretend to be operating upon.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] who is the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations and one of the strongest supporters we have of rebuilding our military.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1530, the 1996 Defense authorization bill. I believe without it, frankly, the 2.4 percent pay increase for the folks in Bosnia and all the military is in great jeopardy. Without this bill, there would be no COLA and other adjustments to offset the inequities between civilians and military.

There are going to be those that might come here today and propose "Well, we could always do a continuing resolution that would take care of those issues." I, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, could not support that, because I think to do that in that manner contradicts the authorization process. We always hear that the appropriators are intruding into the authorizers or the authorizers are intruding into the appropriations process. The fact is we have no different types of process. The way to handle major policy issues generally is by virtue of the authorization process. This bill should pass, because

we need to establish the policy of defense in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution would neglect the critical procurement and Pentagon reforms that are needed, that must be updated, and would thus be neglected in a continuing resolution. A continuing resolution would omit authorization for new starts in military construction and military housing. Some \$458 million in increases might not be properly appropriated for construction of 68 barracks. Quality of life projects serving some 9,200 military families in one fashion or another will not occur without this authorization. Without this bill, we might retard the deployment of an effective missile defense system.

Others have said that is a good deal, that we do not need a missile defense system. We know how fast technology has changed in this world over the last 10 years. All you have to do is sit in front of your little personal computer and do things that rooms full of computers could not do just 10 or 15 years ago. There are a lot of people, with the best of intentions in the world, that can sit in front of those computers and send missiles 2,200 or 3,200 miles across the globe and they can put attachments on those missiles which can deliver nuclear, chemical, and biological warheads.

This country today does not have the ability to defend against one of those missiles, and certainly not an intercontinental ballistic missile, so I believe it is imperative that this bill pass so we can address, properly and intelligently, the need to deploy a system that can protect our people, the people of this Nation, of this continent, and all around the world, people in our Armed Forces in every corner of the globe, against incoming missiles.

I believe it is important to pass this bill so no longer will we be seeing attempts by the administration to tie our hands and keep our Armed Forces from doing what they should be doing, and that is deploying defenses against such incoming missiles.

Without the bill we would omit vital revisions in command and control rules for our military forces involved in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

We would not be addressing the need identified by every commander in the field to increase readiness and training funding.

And, without this bill, we would not have the modernization program increases in shipbuilding, tanks, and aircraft modernization programs that have been cut 70 percent since 1985.

Proponents of a selective CR would fail to address the real need for defense policy changes.

That may be what they want, * * * but that is not good for our arms forces or our country—at a time when our troops need our closest attention!!

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this defense authorization conference report.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague,

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, as others have pointed out, this bill is stacked with weapons that the Pentagon does not need or want, and the cost of these unwanted weapons will threaten more pressing priorities, such as decent pay, sufficient O&M funding, and a capable civilian work force.

This bill will also undermine our leadership on anti-personnel land mines. The Senate overwhelmingly approved an amendment to enact a 1-year moratorium on the United States of AP land mines, but in this conference the House would sabotage that with an amendment that would require DOD certification before the amendment went into effect. This would hurt our leadership in the next session of the review conference of the 1980 land mines protocol. Our previous leadership was based on a congressionally approved export moratorium which was helpful in bringing nations to the table. The language in this conference will take that progress back.

In addition, without a hearing at all, the Republican leadership stripped language that would have given more flexibility to DOD in administering the demining grants and providing demining equipment to other countries. This only means more innocent women, men, and children will be killed or injured by land mines.

Former U.S. Marine Corps Commandant Al Gray has stated, "We kill more Americans with our mines than we do anyone else. We have never killed many enemies with mines." This is clearly an irresponsible bill for many reasons, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it, and thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense authorization conference report. I commend Chairman SPENCE and all the conferees for their dedication to revitalizing U.S. national security.

Included in this conference report are provisions to significantly reform the procurement system of the Department of Defense and the civilian agencies of the Federal Government. These provisions are consistent with H.R. 1670, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995, which was a joint initiative of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on National Security. H.R. 1670 passed the House by a vote of 423 to 0 in September of this year.

The language in this conference agreement represents the efforts of many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both chambers who

have joined with us in rejecting the status quo, and who are prepared to lead the way toward reforming a system which, for years, has become increasingly more arcane, more convoluted, and therefore, more costly—both to Government buyers and to businesses wanting to participate in the Federal marketplace.

This conference agreement promotes affordable and common sense approaches to meet our budgetary goals by, among other things: providing for the increased use of commercial items; increasing the competitiveness of U.S. defense products in international markets; eliminating numerous government-unique procedures; and creating a new system for the purchase and management of Federal information technology.

We are in a unique situation today. This could be our only opportunity to see these significant reforms enacted into law. Therefore, it is vital that my colleagues join me in voting for H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense authorization conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman of the Committee if he might enter into a colloquy with me with regard to section 4203 of the bill.

Section 4203 of the bill will greatly simplify and streamline commercial acquisitions under \$5 million. In my view, this is a long-overdue and much needed change. The purchase of commercial items logically lends itself to simplified procedures because there exists a yardstick in the commercial marketplace against which to measure price and quality and to serve as a surrogate for government-unique procedures.

I simply would like to clarify that it is not the intent of this section to encourage agencies to structure their procurements as a series of multiple, low-dollar value purchases so that each component falls under the \$5 million threshold. Am I correct that this is not the intent of the section?

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

Mr. CLINGER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The original proposal offered by the House did not include a threshold for the application of simplified procedures when buying commercial items. While I do not wish to reopen this issue with respect to this bill, no threshold here would have permitted the use of simplified procedures where it was appropriate. Now, we have an arbitrary dividing line between the application of different procedures for the same commercial items.

The problem you raise is a problem generally with the arbitrary application of thresholds. Nonetheless, this language is not intended to allow vendors or Federal buyers to manipulate Federal requirements in order to gain short-term returns that may result from the use of simplified procedures.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have mixed emotions about this conference report. On the one hand, I commend our chairman and ranking member for taking us in to repair the quality of life, the modernization, the pay raises, the COLAs, those kinds of things. But I have a real problem with even the procedure of how we got here with this conference report. I am a conferee. Frankly, I did not even know they were meeting.

I also have problems with outyear obligations. During the hearing process, and I know my friends over there will remember, there was an outrage over the shortfall of the President's budget, \$30 to \$100 billion, if I recall. We coughed up \$7 billion more. That is OK. I think there are some things we could have used that money for that would have accelerated programs and corrected some of the problems that we had out there. However, what we did with this money is essentially create a problem in outyears to the point where we are going to have a train wreck. We are going to find, in fact, where we did little down payments on these programs, and then we issued coupon books that said, "Hey, we are going to pay you some money in the future," I think we are going to have a huge shortfall in outyears.

For instance, \$30 million for ASAT, antisatellite programs, with an additional \$150 million in outyears. That program was not terminated. In fact, I think it brings us into a dangerously serious problem with militarization of space.

The B-2 was given \$493 million, but it is really \$2.5 billion; and \$700 million to Sea Wolf, really it is \$7 billion. Worst of all, ballistic missile defense. Everybody can say we cannot defend against one missile, but one missile is not our threat. Our threat is a cruise missile off the back of a freighter headed down the coast. We have no kind of protection against anything like this.

It also causes us to unilaterally abrogate the START II Treaty. This we could have done better on. There are minds in this institution that have a little bit of military experience. They were never asked to participate in the conference.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1530. On a bipartisan basis, the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, has worked hard to produce a military construction program which makes significant improvements in our military infrastructure and enhances the quality of life for service personnel and their families. At a time when Americans

are being deployed to Bosnia, we must do all we can to support the troops and their families. This bill does that.

Over 9,200 military families will benefit from new construction as well as improvements to existing family housing units. For junior unaccompanied personnel and the Guard and Reserve components, this bill provides for 68 new barracks projects. We have also provided needed child development centers and medical facilities for our personnel. In addition, we also provided important facilities improvements to enhance the readiness of our forces. Without an authorization bill, none of these projects will go forward.

The conference report also provides for an important reform that, over the long-term, will go a long way toward resolving the military housing crisis. Working closely with the Secretary of Defense, we have developed a program to encourage the private sector to develop troop housing and military family housing at installations where there is a certified shortage of quality housing—and we know that there are tens of thousands of such units in our present inventory. The housing crisis is deplorable and we must act to change it.

This legislation will begin to reverse years of benign neglect of our military infrastructure. It is a good bill and deserves the support of the House and the signature of the President.

□ 1330

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

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that section 2836 could be applied to the Naval Air Station in Glenview, IL, with respect to a portion of the property occupied by the Coast Guard.

Mr. HEFLEY. That is correct. The Department of Defense would have the discretion to apply the provision in that manner.

Mr. PORTER. Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the phrase, "for a use similar to a use under the lease," which appears in section 2837(a). Given that the provision is intended to reduce economic burdens on local communities, with regard to Glenview Naval Air Station, would similar use be confined to use as an air facility?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. In that case, "similar use" could only mean continued use as an air facility.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], my distinguished colleague.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, as one of many Democrats who support a strong national defense, I will vote in favor of this measure. While I do not agree with all of the priorities in this bill, I believe it does maintain America's preeminence as the world's one remaining superpower.

On a personal note, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for the personal courtesy and graciousness which he always extends to every member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would also be remiss, though, if I did not express my serious concern about the process by which this conference report was constructed. To me, far more important than any single measure or issue or program in this bill is the tradition of this House that national defense bills have been developed on a bipartisan basis. I do not believe that was the case in this conference report.

In general, Democratic conferees were excluded from decisions on a number of key national issues. In general, Democratic conferees were not kept adequately informed on the process of this report. Whether intentional or not, this conference report was not put together on a bipartisan basis, and if not corrected, I believe that would be a terribly dangerous precedent for the future of our Nation's defense.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make these comments with any malice toward the majority party leaders of our Committee on National Security. They are good people, they are caring people, and decent people. In fairness, the majority party and its committee leaders have the right to set the tone and the priorities for this defense bill. I have no qualm with that. However, if next year's conference committee process is not more bipartisan than this one was, then I fear greatly that we will have started down a slippery slope toward partisan national defense conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that would be bad for our country, harmful to our national security, and unfair to the men and women serving in the armed forces.

Finally, I want to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN]. The gentleman exercised both personal courage and severe tenacity in fighting for the children of military families. Because of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] and his efforts, we have an impact aid program in this bill that will ensure that the children of military families will receive a quality education.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that our defense strategists and planners and all of our NCO and officer corps and right down to the men in the field say different things to different Members of this Chamber and the other body. I think it depends on our track record, if it is public, statements off the floor, our whole track record of voting over the years.

They take into consideration the whole person when they tell us things,

because I am being told off committee that the Air Force does want the B-2. I am being told that they do not want people who are infected with the AIDS virus and cannot give blood to us, that they are taken out of airplanes, off ships, that they cannot do anything that they were hired to do. They will never see or touch a gun again, they will never be in a tank or a helicopter. So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot listen to these arguments that nothing changes and they are valuable.

They have said to me, including the commission by former Chief of Staff of the Army Wickham, General Wickham, please release them, and other people who are not strong and healthy and deployable.

On abortions, every single military doctor in Europe and in the Pacific does not want to crush a baby's skull in the mother's womb and abort them. These doctors, like two military doctors on our side of the aisle who serve in the House, say, we are here to defend American life, not to kill American life.

As far as all of the systems we put in here, I just bumped into an Air Force officer at that kiosk by the gate and he said, Congressman DORNAN, you buy them, we fly them. Please, sir, give us the best, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we heard some hypocrisy about supporting the troops from people that have never said that before in their lives in the debate on Bosnia the other night in the midst of a blizzard and 16 out of—15 out of 16 flights being diverted that I wish people would go out more in the field and talk to the men and women who serve us and ask them what they want.

I have a list here of all of the good things we put in this bill, particularly my Subcommittee on Military Personnel, starting with a pay raise. This is a great bill that Mr. SPENCE has crafted. I implore you to vote for it and truly support our men and women in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, let me quickly outline key milestones in this carefully crafted Defense authorization. I would title it "Republicans Restore Defense Spending after Clinton Cuts Combat Readiness in spite of Task Force Eagle going into Bosnia."

No. 1, President Bill Clinton has more than doubled the defense cuts promised by Candidate Clinton—\$120 billion! We stop that erosion.

No. 2, Clinton's defense plan—the Bottom Up Review—should be called the Bottom Out Plan—it's underfunded by as much as \$150 billion. We address that outrage.

No. 3, Republicans, under the leadership of Captain FLOYD SPENCE, have restored \$7 billion to defense, including programs I personally helped initiate such as: additional funding for Army "scout" helicopters—both the OH-58D "Kiowa Warrior" and the sleek RAH-66 "Comanche"; additional funding to build more than a mere 20 B-2 Spirit stealth bombers and equip the B-1B Lancer with precision guided munitions; and additional funding for a near term ballistic missile defense, upper tier capability, using existing Navy Aegis cruisers and destroyers.

No. 4, my Subcommittee on Military Personnel, thanks to the efforts of my ranking Democrat OWEN PICKETT and the hard work of all my subcommittee members improved military quality of life significantly by: the payraise; increasing military housing allowance by 35 percent; setting permanent personnel levels to stop the drawdown; and increasing the number of National Guard technicians.

No. 5, I also included several initiatives that reverse the trend of liberal social experimentation programs within the Department designed to conduct combat operations.

This bill: stops abortions at U.S. military hospitals; stops pay for convicted military felons in the brig or civilian prisons; establishes strict new guidelines for the accountability of our heroic American prisoners of war and missing in action; discharges all non-combat usable, non-deployable AIDS/HIV infected personnel; and awards the AFEM [Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal] to United States veterans of El Salvador.

I would remind those who oppose this bill of the wise words of one of our Founding Fathers, Benjamin Franklin, who warned:

The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it.

That says it all as to why we should support our troops, support modernization, and support this superb conference report.

So, in closing Mr. Speaker, I submit my remarks specifically related to the Defense authorization bill that lives up to the Republican commitment for a strong national defense presented in the Contract With America. The military personnel provisions within the bill are at the heart of what makes the bill a national security legislative milestone highlighting the differences between Bill Clinton and the Congress on defense issues.

In response to troubling revelations suggesting that the readiness of our units and the quality of life for our service members and their families were approaching dangerous levels, my Subcommittee on Military Personnel responded to address the needs of service members and make readiness a top priority.

Before we get into quality of life and readiness issues, let me assure the over 300 cosponsors of H.R. 2664, the appropriations bill from Mr. YOUNG's shop, that this conference report includes a provision that restores equity to the payment of cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] to military retirees.

The bill attacks quality of life problems directly with a 2.4-percent pay raise and a series of other enhancements to compensation, including a housing allowance increase that was 35 percent larger than the administration's. The bill also protects members from increased out-of-pocket costs by guaranteeing housing allowance payments so long as the member remains committed to a mortgage or rent payment at a location.

Readiness of our forces was the motivation for language to terminate the dramatic manpower drawdown that eliminated over 630,000 patriotic people

from the Armed Forces. The provision establishes permanent end strength levels that preserve at least key elements of the capability necessary to carry out our Nation's defense strategy of supporting two major regional conflicts.

In terms of our reserve forces, the bill provides increased numbers of full-time military technicians to support deployable units and establishes income protection and dental insurance programs to increase the readiness of individual reservists.

The bill also corrects the societal insult of convicted military felons continuing to receive military pay while serving extended jail sentences.

In addition, finally a critically important section of the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to centralize the oversight and policy responsibility at the Department of Defense level and establish a rigorous process to account for our heroic missing-in-action. This is an issue of intense personal interest to me. It is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a powerful statement in support of our men and women in uniform, to include the 200 deployed to Bosnia and the tens of thousands soon to be deployed to the Balkans and the Adriatic. I strongly implore my colleagues to adopt this conference report and truly support our forces in harms way.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my distinguished colleague who just left the well by saying that the gentleman's articulation is precisely why we ought to have hearings and come to policy based on rational and intelligent discourse as opposed to having a meeting with a particular person off the floor.

That is one of the reasons why we oppose this bill is because there are a number of issues that have been dealt with in the bill, not within the framework and the dignity of the legislative process, but who said what off the floor and in what building. That is not the way to run a government that is considered the greatest democracy in the world.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has asked my Subcommittee on Military Personnel to have hearings on racism in the military, and I agree with the gentleman. It is utterly offensive and awful.

There are some things that we have had so many committee meetings in other committees on, like abortion, that that is why I did not have hearings on that. However, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be one of my star witnesses; we will get together on that.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] said that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

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

The Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Defense Authorization Act, conference report, H.R. 1530.

My friends, I know that the defense appropriations bill has already been signed into law. I opposed this bill when it was considered on the floor of the House, and I strongly urged the President to veto it. It was a bad bill, and it is a bad law.

Now, we are considering the defense authorization bill. Again, I say to my colleagues, this is a bad bill. It wastes too much money on hardware we don't need, and it prevents investing in our children which we do need.

This agreement calls for \$1.4 billion for the B-2 stealth bomber and \$3.8 billion for a cold-war-style missile defense system. All told, this conference agreement calls for \$7.1 billion more than the Pentagon asked for.

While at the same time, I want to remind you that the new majority's budget cuts title I education funds by \$1.1 billion. Meaning that over 1 million children in our Nation's poorest communities will lose their chance for a decent education.

And, don't forget, that the new majority is cutting \$182 billion in Medicaid funding. Meaning that over 4.4 million children had better not get sick, because, they won't have health care.

And this new majority is shredding the safety net and ending the Federal guarantee of assistance for poor children. The Gingrich welfare reform bill will push at least 1.2 million more children into poverty.

This tells children, if you're poor, don't get sick, don't get hungry, don't get cold, because we don't think you're important.

But here in the Gingrich Congress, if you're a defense contractor, you are really important.

This is an outrage. Where are our priorities?

Vote "no" on the defense authorization conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the recognition of the gentleman from South Carolina.

To the gentleman, let me say that we have a number of areas of common interest and I appreciate very much the cooperation of the gentleman and his working with us, and that of his staff as well.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the conference report currently before the House does not authorize any operations and maintenance funds for the SR-71 reconnaissance program; is that correct?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is

correct. Neither the House nor the Senate defense authorization bill contained any specific O&M in the authorization for the SR-71. Therefore, the conference report, similarly, does not authorize any funds for this purpose.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that response.

Mr. Speaker, it remains my view that this system is no longer a cost-effective platform for conducting strategic reconnaissance and should be retired to storage in the coming year. I would also note that section 504 of the National Security Act specifically denies the ability to obligate appropriated funds for this purpose without a specific corresponding authorization.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman's assessment and agree that the denial of O&M authorization for the SR-71 should lead to the termination of this program during the fiscal year 1996.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], chairman of our Subcommittee on Readiness.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security for yielding this time to me and commend him for his efforts and his leadership of the committee during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have presided over the Subcommittee on Readiness and its responsibility for the operation and maintenance accounts which total \$92.3 billion that are involved in this bill.

Reference was made earlier to the fact that there has been a change in the geopolitical environment in which we live today since the termination of the Cold War, and I totally concur with that statement. However, one of the ironies of that fact is that, with it, we have had a higher operational tempo for our military personnel than we did during the height of the cold war.

As we hear complaints about this bill authorizing more than the President requested, we should bear in mind that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have publicly indicated that the defense program of the President over the next 4 or 5 years is \$40 billion to \$60 billion deficient in the modernization accounts which are absolutely essential to what we are going to do.

There are so many good things in this bill that I do not have an opportunity in this 2 minutes to outline all of the things that are there. Let me close this 2 minutes simply by saying that on Wednesday or Thursday evening, not one voice was heard in this Chamber, except to say, we want to support our troops who are shortly to be deployed to Bosnia. That major deployment is going onward, as the peace treaty in Paris has been signed.

The last thing in the world that we should contemplate doing would be not to pass this bill to provide them with the things that they need, and not to shatter their morale by indicating, by the defeat of this bill, that we are not interested in their quality of life, that we are not interested in their pay raise, that we are not interested in providing them the equipment which they need.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Military Readiness Subcommittee, I rise in strong support of this conference report and urge its adoption.

Yesterday, the Bosnia peace agreement was signed in Paris.

Today, the deployment of 20,000 United States forces to Bosnia will commence in earnest. U.S. troops are embarking on a mission of uncertain outcome and of significant risk. They will do their duty proudly and with honor, and with the belief that their Government will provide them the necessary resources and support to accomplish their difficult task.

It is the responsibility of this Congress and the President to keep faith with our military personnel and demonstrate our commitment to their welfare and the welfare of their families.

I firmly believe the conference report on H.R. 1530, the Fiscal Year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act does this. It ensure force readiness and it improves the quality of life for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

Press reports that President Clinton intends to veto this authorization bill are troubling. A veto of this measure would be inconsistent with supporting the U.S. forces he is sending into harm's way.

This bill takes concrete action in support of our forces. Vote "yes" on adoption of the conference report on H.R. 1530.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

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

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Readiness, I commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] for the effort he made to finalize the conference report. The gentleman did yeoman duty under difficult circumstances, and I am honored to count him not only as my colleague, but as my friend.

Mr. Speaker, we enter the year on a less than light note with a barrage of allegations questioning the readiness of our Armed Forces.

□ 1345

During a series of hearings early in the year, the committee and our subcommittee learned that many of these allegations simply were not true.

Nevertheless, we can always do better. Anyone who reads the House version of the bill, as well as the conference report, will find that we have enhanced readiness. Operations, maintenance and training accounts are fully funded. Real property maintenance, depot maintenance and base operations support have been strengthened. We established a short-term financing mech-

anism to cover initial costs of continuing operations and prevent shortfalls like those we experienced at the end of last year.

Some will remember this is something I tired to do 2 years ago as chairman of the Investigations Subcommittee.

We also took a variety of steps to improve quality of life for military personnel and their families, and we included a number of initiatives that will save money by ensuring more efficient use of DOD resources.

All of us are concerned with DOD's privatization initiatives, which we will see more of, by the way, in the coming years. However, one of the most important issues before our subcommittee this year involved a 60-40 split as it pertains to government depots. Our committee position proved to be a good starting point for what was finally accepted by the conference.

The conference report requires DOD to study the issue and to develop a plan which must be approved by Congress before it can be implemented. That represents a victory for the bipartisan depot caucus represented by Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WATTS, Mrs. FOWLER, and others. It puts DOD on notice that Congress will take a more balanced, responsible approach to this issue.

Although I do not like everything in this bill, I ask for your support. That is one thing that we can get together on, supporting the armed services of this country.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from some people on the other side of the aisle in a bipartisan way who are supporting this bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement and another strong defender of defense in this country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I compliment him, the chairman of this committee. I compliment the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

I thank and congratulate the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee on which I have the privilege of being the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], for the excellent work that we have done; to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], on whose subcommittee I serve, for his persistence on the MIA issue.

This is a good bill. It is not just because it includes good language for the B-2 that it takes a step forward. But we have spent a great part of this week talking about supporting the troops.

This bill supports the troops. It gives them a pay raise. It helps with their family allowance. It supports the families better. It adds to the figure that was going down regarding maintenance and training.

Mr. Speaker, we have the finest military ever known in this country. This

bill will help keep us a very, very strong and fine military for those arduous duties that are expected of these fine young men and women.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I am proud of key elements of this bill which after the military construction program and focus on improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families.

This bill would provide both short and long term solutions to a critical problem that impacts the retention and readiness of our Armed Forces.

By focusing on improvements to troop and military families, and setting strict priorities within the military construction program, we ensure that the housing backlog is addressed and quality of life is improved.

Furthermore, the bill includes a series of new authorities which would encourage the private sector to develop housing for unaccompanied personnel and military families at installations where there is a certified shortage of quality housing.

This initiative has strong bipartisan support, including the support of the Secretary of Defense.

This bill is not perfect, but it is a good bill that places priority on improving readiness and the quality of life programs that impact our personnel and their families.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a very strong proponent of the military and especially R&D.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. We have heard three major issues raised here.

First of all, we raised the issue of spending money on the military as opposed to jobs. I would ask my colleagues to express that feeling to the 600,000 union workers who have lost their jobs in the last 8 years, primarily in the UAW and the Machinists, because of defense cuts.

We have heard about budgetary increases. I would ask my colleagues not to ask the political appointees at the Pentagon but to ask the service chiefs, each one of whom came to us personally and asked for the additional funding that we plused up.

But my real concern is the outrage expressed by several of our colleagues

over this bill violating treaties. This bill in no way violates any treaty of this country. Period. Not the ABM treaty, not the START Treaty.

In fact, we have now boxed the administration into an impossible position for them. Because now, in agreement with Senator NUNN and the administration over the language, we have removed all but one key difference, and that is a date certain for deploying a system, not a system that will violate the ABM treaty but a system in line with what the Russians already have.

The Russians have the world's only operational ABM system, and what we have done now is, we have allowed for the deployment of a similar system that the Army and the Air Force have both said on the record they could do from a single site, not in violation of the ABM treaty; in the Air Force case at a cost of \$2.25 billion over 4 years, in the Army's case using FAD at a cost of \$5 billion over 4 years.

The reason the administration is threatening a veto, Mr. Speaker, is very simple and very clear: They are now between a rock and a hard place. We have removed all the rhetoric. There is no more contention that this violates any treaty, because Bob Bell and the administration knows full well it does not. What this bill simply says is, we want to have the same potential to defend the American people that the Russians have within the confines of the ABM treaty.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to put up or shut up, and protect the people or veto this bill.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the defense authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat on this floor and listened to the Gingrich Republicans talk about a balanced budget day after day after day. Where are they today?

The Gingrich Republicans want to cut Medicare and increase military spending. They want to cut student loans and increase military spending. They want to cut Medicaid and increase military spending. They want to cut education and increase military spending. Billions of dollars for new and expanded weapons systems, the B-2, the C-17, *Seawolf*, Trident, and on and on and on.

Think about it. You simply cannot increase military spending, give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and balance the budget. Speaker GINGRICH's math simply does not add up. I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

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

Could the chairman please describe the outcome reached by the conferees on the B-2 bomber program?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the conference outcome on the B-2 successfully establishes the conditions necessary to permit the production of additional B-2 bombers beyond the currently authorized 20 aircraft. To achieve this end, the conference report has authorized an additional \$493 million in procurement funds, repealed existing statutory restrictions on the procurement of long-lead items and repealed the statutory caps on the number of B-2's that can be acquired and on the total program cost.

There are several key issues, however, that require clarification for the legislative record. First, as both the bill and report language clearly indicates, the fence on the obligation of B-2 funds until March 31, 1996, applies only to the \$493 million in additional fiscal year 1996 procurement funds. In no way does this fence impact obligation of prior-year B-2 funding.

Therefore, the balance of the \$125 million authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1995 to sustain the B-2 industrial base is available immediately for such purposes. The use of the phrase "merge with the \$493 million" in no way captures any prior-year funding and refers only to the use of those funds for the same purpose as the \$493 million.

Second, I would expect the Department of Defense to act expeditiously in the months ahead to sustain B-2 industrial base in such a way as to protect the option to utilize the \$493 million to procure long-lead items for additional B-2 aircraft.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the chairman. Is it therefore the chairman's perspective that the purpose for which the additional \$493 million is being authorized is the facilitization and acquisition of long-lead items necessary to procure additional B-2 aircraft if such a decision is made in the future?

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman would yield. Consistent with the purposes specified in House Report 104-131 and House Report 104-208, the increased authorized of \$493 million for the program is expressly for the purpose of beginning the process of reestablishing critical elements of the B-2 production line and procuring long-lead items consistent with the acquisition of additional B-2 aircraft.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the chairman. In the interest of time, I ask that the remainder of our colloquy be placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that colloquies cannot be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MCKEON. I ask that the remainder of the statement be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, each Member may submit his own statement in the RECORD.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would finish with the statement that the purpose for which the additional \$493 million is being authorized

is the facilitization and acquisition of long-lead items necessary to procure additional B-2 aircraft if such a decision is made in the future. This is consistent with the purposes specified in House Report 104-131 and House Report 104-208, which indicate that the increased authorization of \$493 million for the program is expressly for the purpose of beginning the process of reestablishing critical elements of the B-2 production line and procuring long-lead items consistent with the acquisition of additional B-2 aircraft.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take these 2 minutes to respond to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania with respect to his comments regarding ballistic missile defense.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, says that it directs the national missile defense to be operationally effective in defending all 50 States including Hawaii and Alaska.

Now, any rational human being would understand that in order to protect 50 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, would require the deployment of a system that goes beyond one site. Once you move to multiple sites, you are abrogating the ABM treaty, No. 1.

The second point, the gentleman asserted that the Russians have the capacity to defend their Nation. When you go back, Mr. Speaker, to the history of the ABM treaty, the Russians have the capacity to defend one site, Moscow, not their nation.

The third point I would like to make. We engage in artfully drawn language so that the term, explicit and implicit, what we know is how this legislation is drafted to protect all 50 States, you are going to have to go to multiple sites. No matter how you split that, that is abrogating the ABM treaty.

Mr. Speaker, one other point that I would make on the ABM. Once you move to multiple sites, I would suggest and challenge any economic analyst in this country to look at what my colleagues have placed in this bill regarding ballistic missile defense. There is no money planned for the out years. This is a budget buster of their own budget because they simply get the nose under the tent this year with a policy statement and in the out years you are talking about tens of billions of dollars that have not been planned for.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The Army and the Air Force have both testified they can deploy a single site to protect all 50 States.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

□ 1400

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, what better time to debate the merits of a bill that supports our military personnel through its provision of pay, housing, and other benefits.

The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, remembers her defenders—the men and women of our Nation's Armed Forces.

This bill increases basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence by 2.4 percent, increases basic allowance for quarters by 5.2 percent, and gives thousands of military members housing choices that were previously unavailable.

It extends the authority for several special pay and bonus programs, corrects the military cost-of-living-adjustment disparity between military and Federal civilian retirees, increases certain aspects of the Montgomery G.I. bill educational assistance, and expands the authority for improvements to military housing.

In his speech accepting the Republican Vice Presidential nomination, Calvin Coolidge said, "the Nation which forgets its defenders will be itself forgotten."

Please support the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise concerning the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

(Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, in 30 seconds I cannot say much. Let me say this, let me assure my colleagues this is a good bill.

In tribute, respect and honor of the 21st TAACOM, my reserve unit that went to the gulf war, 2 hours ago I learned they are now headed to Europe to, Bosnia. So let me say I wish them Godspeed. I will be with you on Sunday. I will always be with you in spirit. We have shared a bond and union together that none of us will ever forget.

So when we stand on this floor and talk about support of the troops, it really comes down to moments like this. Do we believe in the modernization of equipment, giving you what you need and the resources you need to protect the force, for you to do your job, to do it well and to do it proudly? We will be there with you.

Please, support this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], our top gun.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, you know, there has been a longtime debate, a legitimate debate, on whether

we need a strong national defense or a socialistic model for this country. But when it comes to the point where defense has been cut so deeply, \$177 billion, we are \$200 billion below the Bottom-Up Review, then we need to add the dollars to protect our kids.

Look at what it costs to go to Haiti, look what it cost, the billions of dollars in Somalia. Bosnia is going to cost billions of dollars.

Where do you think that money comes from? Many of us did not support any of those activities, but yet some of those that would fight for more dollars for the social programs supported those issues, and that is a legitimate debate. But we also need to protect our kids, and that is what I talked about the other night in the Bosnia issue when it comes time to protect our soldiers so they do not come back in body bags, and we give them the wherewithal to come back, then we do it.

This bill does that, and I ask for support.

Among the many vital programs that the fiscal year 1996 Defense Authorization Conference Report moves forward is the B-2 stealth bomber program. The conference report provides \$493 million in additional B-2 procurement authorization in order to permit the continuation of the B-2 production beyond 20 aircraft.

The conferees also repealed the previous restrictions on the procurement of long-lead items for the B-2 program and the standing cap on the numbers of bombers that would be produced. We clearly feel that the B-2 program, which provides our Air Force with the technological edge and the security to accomplish its missions without the massive air and ground support that other bombers require, should move forward beyond 20 aircraft.

The B-2 production facilities are currently operating under the balance of the \$125 million in fiscal 1995 funds that were provided for the program last year. In further authorizing the B-2 program for fiscal 1996, the conferees fenced the availability of the \$493 million authorization, and will not preclude the Department of Defense [DOD] from acting to sustain the industrial base and the production and procurement activity necessary to smoothly maintain the B-2 production program.

In fact, the conferees expect that, based upon our realization of the need for a continuing B-2 program, the DOD will act to sustain the B-2 industrial base activity until the new funds are made available. This will allow the ongoing program operations to continue and will prevent the additional costs that the DOD would incur if it had to restart any portion of the industrial base's activities.

The B-2 stealth bomber is an important part of this Congress' renewed effort to maintain a sound and solid American defense. Our commitment to a reinvigorated, modern stock of defense assets coupled with our dedication to solid core readiness, an improved quality of life for our service people, and a Pentagon that runs like a business, will help ensure our national security for decades to come.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to get right to the point. I think

we have seen over the last 10 years a 35-percent real cut in defense spending, but that only masks part of the problem because we have seen about a 70 percent decline in spending on procurement from the standpoint of our Navy and shipbuilding that has brought us to an absolute low point in terms half domestic capability, our industrial base to build naval ships.

I think that one of the important things about this authorization is that it finally says enough is enough, and it starts to rebuild the important defense component represented by naval shipbuilding.

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

Mr. Speaker, we come to the end of the debate on this conference report to the bill, H.R. 1530, and I would end the way I began. I rise in opposition to this conference report on procedural grounds and on substantive grounds.

I indicated that I would not go into the procedural issues. I think, on a collegial basis, my colleagues and I need to sit down, close the door, and hammer these procedural issues out so we move beyond them and we do not make the same mistakes as we did this year. I realize that it is a learning curve.

With respect to the substantive issues, I would point out to my colleagues that the administration does, indeed, plan to veto this bill. Two very specific reasons for the veto, Mr. Speaker: I would reiterate, the administration has expressed serious concerns about the impact of the proposed conference report language on Russian consideration of the START-II treaty which is designed to produce a major reduction in Russian nuclear weapons.

Why we would want to send the wrong message in that regard when we owe it to ourselves, our children, and our children's children to engage in major reductions of nuclear weapons from this planet is a mystery to this gentleman.

Second, the administration is also concerned, as I have stated earlier, that this language could, indeed, lead the Russians to abandon other arms control agreements if they conclude that it is, indeed, United States policy to take unilateral action to abandon or otherwise walk away from the ABM Treaty.

These are awesome and important issues and for those reasons, alone, my colleagues ought to vote against this conference report.

As I stated earlier, we find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in the context of the post-cold war world. An enormous gift has been given us. We now have an enormous opportunity to think boldly and to take the world into the future contemplating peace, not contemplating war. If you look at this budget, you will see a number of cold war relics being pushed forward in this budget at a time when our country is standing still, holding its breath about the budget negotiations that are taking place between the administration and the legislative branch of Government.

This bill purports to increase the military budget by \$7 billion at a time when we spend as much as all the rest of the world combined and when you add in our allies we spend in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget. We outspend any potential adversary 4 to 1.

Yes, there are some good things in this bill. There are some good quality-of-life things in this bill. But a \$7 billion increase is not one of them. Potential abrogation of the ABM Treaty is not one of them. Sending the wrong message so the Russians back off of START-II is, indeed, not one of them. Engaging in placing weapons systems forward in this bill that go far beyond any balanced budget implications that my colleagues have talked about in other areas is certainly, indeed, not one of them. To engage in a cold war approach to the world when we are in a post-cold-war environment, trying to find new ways to relate to each other, to move beyond war to peace and beyond waramaking to peacemaking and beyond risking a war to risking peace are all of the reasons why I would suggest that my colleagues oppose this conference report, for procedural issues, there are substantive, and very much of concern to this gentleman, and on the substantive grounds that I have had.

With those remarks, again I would urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a leader on the appropriations defense issue, opposes the bill. The gentleman from the intelligence committee opposes this bill. My distinguished colleague, who is a counterpart on this committee as ranking minority member in the other body, also opposes this conference report. This ought to give rise to serious concern that we have gone down the wrong path in this conference.

I urge my colleagues to follow us and vote against the conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 1530, fiscal year 1996, and I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the distinguished chairman of the committee, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and the conferees for a great job. And I would like to note that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is the first Republican chairman of this committee since Dewey Short back in 1953, and he has been doing an outstanding job.

I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

The conference report before us today retains the emphasis on a strong national de-

fense, procurement reform, and quality of life for our troops and their families that merited the strong support H.R. 1530 received in the House earlier this year.

This conference report will improve the quality of life for our troops and their families by providing a 2.4-percent military pay raise, enhancing military housing and medical benefits, providing equity in COLA payments for our military retirees, and increased funding for family housing. As the holiday season approaches and our Nation deploys troops in Bosnia, I can think of no better time to show our troops and their families that we support them by the passage of this conference report.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this conference report will insure a strong national defense, and provide a number of important process and structural Pentagon reforms necessary to increase the Pentagon's efficiency and effectiveness.

Finally, I would like to point out to my colleagues that included in this conference report are important DOD reforms with regard to POW-MIA procedures. As my colleagues may recall I introduced H.R. 945, the Missing Service Personnel Act, earlier this year, based upon my belief that improvements were needed in the process by which DOD accounts for our American service members who are prisoners of war or missing in action.

Since the Vietnam war, Congress has struggled to find ways for obtaining the full accounting of American servicemen reportedly still missing. By adopting the provisions contained in H.R. 945 the conference report will ensure that a full accounting is done, not only for those who are missing from Vietnam, but from all wars since World War II.

This provision is strongly supported by the American Legion, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the National League of Families, as well as many other POW/MIA organizations.

For all of the aforesaid reasons, for the families and troops who are currently being deployed to Bosnia, and for the families of those still missing from past military deployments, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], who is the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are. It is about 10 years since the buildup under President Ronald Reagan, and for the Members who have talked about the expenditures and how we are busting the budget and spending too much money, this defense bill is about \$100 billion less in real dollars than the 1986 defense budget.

I think if we came in today, we have heard almost exactly the same speeches that we heard 10 years ago when the budget was \$100 billion more. I think if we cut it by \$100 billion on the floor in the next 3 minutes, we would still have the same feelings and the same speeches on each side.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman will yield, I promise you I would back off if you do that.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. Let me commend the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for his work during the year and our great chair-

man, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], who, with his modesty and his good sense of humor and his great integrity, has held this committee together and worked through the conference process; my old friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], who has had more meetings in his office than we have in mine on issues that affect this committee; and the young men and women in uniform, folks, this is a good bill. It provides equipment. It provides the best in terms of expanding America's airpower, our seapower, our airlift, our ammunition, our basic spares, all the things that are needed by people in uniform to project American power and carry out American foreign policy.

In this brave new world that we have all talked about, where are we? We are engaged in a policy in Bosnia that resolves down to a man and a weapon with a bayonet on the end of it. That is projection of American power through American uniformed service people.

Now, this is the bill that supports the troops. This has the 2.4-percent pay raise. It has the housing allowance.

Let me just tell you, none of our troops read concurrent resolutions. They do read pay raises.

Please, support the troops. Support American strength. Vote for this conference report.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that section 2838 of H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, reflects a provision I had offered in the House version of the bill designed to speed up the redevelopment process once a military base is closed.

Anyone who has lived through a base closure process, as I have, knows that one of the most difficult challenges in trying to cope with the various layers of Federal bureaucracy once the actual decision has been made to close the base. At the heart of the problem lies the Stewart M. McKinney Homeless Act, which virtually has guaranteed that homeless providers have a chance to express interest in property on closing bases regardless of what the local community has in mind in the way of redevelopment plans. As part of this whole process, the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] has been able to hold up any transfer of property for reuse purposes until it was satisfied that all possible uses for the homeless—no matter how remote—were included in a base redevelopment plan.

I introduced legislation, which passed the House of Representatives overwhelmingly, designed to lessen the role of HUD and to give more authority to local redevelopment authorities planning for the reuse of closed military bases. Although the Clinton administration believed my amendment was too strong, the Department of Defense worked on the Senate side to develop alternative language that had a similar purpose, that is, to make the base reuse process more friendly to local communities and less under the control of HUD and its homeless constituencies around the country.

The final version as approved by the conferees is consistent with my purpose. HUD no longer will have the final say in the distribution

of real property on closing military bases. Instead, DOD will have the final authority for such disposal, but only after close consultation with the local community and after deferring to the redevelopment goals as set forth in the local redevelopment authority's reuse plan.

Although the base reuse process is far from perfect, I believe the section 2838 will strengthen the role of the local community and in doing so will help expedite the reuse process. Economically productive activities will begin much more quickly at closing military installations. In my view, the fundamental purpose of base reuse should be the restoration of lost economic activity in the local community. I believe section 2838 helps focus the reuse process on this objective, and I am proud to have played a role in its adoption.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this measure. Without a doubt, our military preparedness is of great importance. This bill will most certainly ensure such. However, this bill goes beyond ensuring our military might—this bill is nothing more than billions of dollars' worth of silver spoons for defense contractors. I wish the Republican majority felt that providing for our elderly, poor, and children was at least as important as providing for the profit margins of defense contractors.

With telling irony, this legislation guarantees our military strength while also establishing our leadership in insensitivity and lack of regard for individual rights. The limitations on abortions for military officers who serve overseas is an egregious assault on the personal liberties of those who risk their personal well-being to serve all of us.

The callous proposal to discharge military personnel who have tested positive for HIV is unfair, if not amoral. What became of judging a person based upon his character and ability? It was not that long ago that this country experienced periods of civil unrest and strife in order that all people would be treated equally. Mr. Speaker, this provision is a step backward for a civilized society. As an American, I am appalled and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the American people will not be fooled.

I urge my colleagues to recommit this measure with the hope that we can consider an agreement that guarantees our military effectiveness, while also reflecting our national priorities, and protecting our ideals of personal liberty and fairness of treatment.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. However, my support of this legislation is tempered somewhat because it does have serious problems that have to be addressed.

I am very happy with the improvements to quality of life for our troops and their families in this legislation. The conference report provides a 2.4 percent military pay raise, enhances military housing and medical benefits, provides equity in COLA payments for our military retirees and increases funding for family housing, barracks and other critical military family activities. I have long been a supporter of these type of initiatives for our military as my record on the House Armed Services Committee and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction demonstrates.

I also am in support of the procurement reform provisions in this legislation. The conference report would: increase the Government's use of commercial items by simplifying procedures and eliminating unnecessary audit

requirements, increase the competitiveness of U.S. defense products in international markets, eliminate costly, burdensome paperwork requirements, and create a new system for the purchase and management of Federal information technology. This is something that the Department of Defense sorely needs.

This legislation also includes a provision important to my home-district. It directs the Department of the Army to cede a 22-acre parcel of land to the Department of Veterans Affairs for the purposes of expanding the Fort Bliss National Cemetery. This would extend the longevity of the cemetery to the year 2020. I am very grateful to the chairman and the ranking member of the National Defense Committee for including this provision in the legislation. I, and the veterans of my community, are extremely grateful for this provision.

However, this conference report does have its problems.

The administration has identified several areas of concern which also trouble me. For one, the command and control provisions governing the operation of U.S. troops during peacekeeping operations. This provision impinges upon the role of the President as Commander in Chief in a manner that could be unconstitutional.

Also, the ballistic missile defense provisions are troubling to the administration. The bill would require the deployment of a national missile defense system by the year 2003. Such a system would constitute unilateral abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty. This could give the Russians reasons to withdraw their support for START II, a dangerous consequence.

The Republican majority, however, did not address these objections in conference. This, even after the repeated insistence of the administration. As a result, the President has threatened a veto of this legislation. If it comes to that, I will have to side with my President.

Other provisions which trouble me include: Department of Defense environmental programs which are underfunded in this bill. There are multi-year environmental cleanups underway at Fort Bliss, TX, located in my congressional district, which could be jeopardized if these provisions are enacted into law;

The termination of the Technology Reinvestment Program [TRP]. This program has been enormously successful in my congressional district with leading manufacturers and the University of Texas at El Paso participating in the program. In the current fiscal year, only \$195 million is provided to complete pending projects;

The requirement of the discharging of members of the Armed Forces who have the HIV-1 virus. This is unnecessary and discriminatory. I have long maintained that this is contrary to the Constitution's guarantee of equality to all Americans. This would preclude the military from utilizing military personnel who are completely functional in their jobs and in whom the military have invested training resources; and

Abortion provisions which would amend permanent law to include the restrictions on the use of Department of Defense facilities for abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger. This issue was incorporated in the bill without a single hearing on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation for now, but await the President's position statement regarding this legislation.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report includes provisions on Government-wide procurement reform, on which I was a conferee. The procurement provisions in the defense authorization conference agreement are an improvement over the most recent procurement bill to pass this House, H.R. 1670.

The conference agreement retains the current statutory definition of full and open competition. The agreement requires Federal agencies to purchase commercial items using full and open competition. It improves Government procurement practices by including my language to require Federal agencies to use cost effective value engineering procedures.

The agreement also incorporates my language retaining the knowing standard for criminal violations of our procurement integrity laws. It includes a provision drafted by Representative MALONEY that improves the performance capability of the frontline contracting personnel. In addition, the agreement includes Representative SPRATT's pilot program on military pay.

Mr. Speaker, since I became the ranking Democratic member on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, I have supported procurement reform. However, I have fought vigorously in committee, on the House floor, and in conference to preserve the current statutory definition of full and open competition.

After a long and hard struggle, I am pleased to report that the conferees have agreed not to make any changes to the Competition and Contracting Act's definition of full and open competition. The report does contain a provision requiring that the Federal acquisition regulation ensure that full and open competition is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the need to efficiently fulfill the Government's requirements. This language should not be interpreted as any limitation to full and open competition, as the statement of managers makes clear.

Let me read from the statement of managers, quote:

The provision would direct that the Federal Acquisition Regulation ensure that the requirement to obtain full and open competition is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the need to efficiently fulfill the governments' requirements.

This provision makes no change to the requirement for full and open competition or the definition of full and open competition.

I am pleased that the conferees agreed with me that changing the definition and requirements for full and open competition was wrong and would have turned back the clock on procurement reform.

Mr. Speaker, I do have concerns about two provisions in this agreement. The conference report permits the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to waive laws relating to commercial off-the-shelf items that impose government unique policies on persons who have been awarded contracts. This language would permit the Administrator to waive critical laws like the Prompt Pay Act, Buy American Act, the Trade Agreements Act, and subcontracting plan requirements for small businesses.

I believe it is bad public policy to allow any administration to determine what laws it will enforce and what laws it will not. That is the

constitutional responsibility of Congress, not the executive branch.

My other major concern involves the elimination of the protest jurisdiction of the General Services Administration Board of Contract Appeals. The GSA board was established in 1984 because of a bipartisan consensus that GAO was ineffective in deciding protests involving computers and telecommunications. GAO lacks the power to compel both the production of testimony as well as documents from third parties. As an arm of the Congress, GAO is constitutionally prohibited from ordering executive agencies to do anything. I am concerned that with a weakened bid protest system agency bureaucrats will be tempted to cut corners and will begin favoring certain companies over others.

Mr. Speaker, while I intend to oppose this conference report, I am pleased that the procurement language in the conference agreement retains full and open competition, the cornerstone of our procurement system.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the provision in the defense authorization conference report which prohibits personnel or dependents from obtaining abortions at U.S. facilities abroad—even if the woman pays all the costs—except to save the life of the woman or in cases of rape or incest.

This ban discriminates against women who have volunteered to serve their country by prohibiting them from exercising their legally protected right to choose. The issue at hand is not about who should pay for the abortion—Department of Defense appropriations bills have prohibited the use of funds to perform abortions at military hospitals in almost all cases since 1979—or whether it is a constitutionally protected right, but whether women who serve overseas will have access to the same medical care they deserve.

This provision overturns the January 1993 Executive order by President Clinton permitting abortions at U.S. military installations overseas, if the procedure was paid for privately by the woman and returns to the policy followed by the Reagan administration in the 1980's.

Prohibiting women from using their own funds to obtain abortion services at overseas military facilities endangers their health. Women stationed overseas depend on their base hospitals for medical care, and are often situated in areas where local facilities are inadequate or unavailable. This policy may result in a woman facing a crisis pregnancy endangering her life, to seek out an illegal or unsafe procedure. It is of no advantage to our military forces to expose female service members to medical conditions that pose a substantial risk of infection, illness, or even death.

This bill sends a clear message to American military women: You can fight for your country, you can die for your country but you cannot get access to a full range of medical services when stationed overseas. Is this really the message we want to send to the brave women serving this Nation? I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for 1996.

I cannot support a bill which calls for spending \$7 billion more of defense

than even the Pentagon has requested. I believe that is the height of absurdity in the current fiscal climate. The \$495 million in long-lead funding for future B-2 bombers is particularly egregious. This bill also actively encourages the Pentagon to violate the ABM treaty. This may cause a serious setback for international nonproliferation efforts, as Russia has declared it will not ratify the START II accord if we abrogate the ABM treaty. In yet another blow to reproductive freedom, this conference report denies the constitutional right of choice to women serving our country by prohibiting women from obtaining abortions at U.S. military facilities.

This report contains major reforms to Government-wide procurement laws, on which I was proud to be named a conferee. These reforms are not perfect, and would undoubtedly be significantly different if Democrats had been doing the drafting. However, they represent an improvement over H.R. 1670 in a number of ways and I would like to commend Ranking Member COLLINS and Chairman CLINGER for their hard work on these issues.

The House bill dramatically altered the full and open competition standard which was created in the landmark Competition in Contracting Act of 1984. This standard has ensured the Federal Government the best return on its dollar for over a decade while at the same time allowed the full participation of small businesses in Federal acquisition. I opposed this change, along with Members from both sides of the aisle. I am glad that, while recognizing the Government's interest in efficient procurement practices, this conference report leaves the full and open competition standard essentially unchanged.

I remain concerned about the use of the streamlined procedures for the purchase of commercial items authorized by this bill. I would have preferred to have had a much lower threshold than the \$5 million contained in this report. But at least we have some threshold, the House passed version contained none at all. The 3-year sunset of this provision, contained in this bill, is also a good idea.

This conference report modifies the repeal of recoupment of research and development costs on U.S. weapons systems contained in the House bill. It requires off-sets through the year 2005 and grants only a limited waiver. I offered an amendment to the House bill which would have had a very similar effect and am glad that this provision is included in the report.

I am less pleased with other procurement provisions in this bill. This bill gives the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy the authority to waive numerous laws relating to procurement of commercial items. This could significantly alter the system without enactment of legislation, raising troubling constitutional questions.

This conference report also eliminates the jurisdiction of the General Services Board of Contract Appeals over bid protests, consolidating bid protest hearings in the GAO. I much preferred the approach of the original House bill on this issue—consolidating bid protests and contract appeals into two boards, one for defense and one civilian.

Mr. Chairman, on a different vehicle and with some minor modifications I might well support many of the procurement reforms included in this conference report. I must however oppose this defense authorization conference report.

One final note. I am pleased that this conference report includes the House-passed language establishing the Civilian Marksmanship Program as a non-profit corporation. As a long-time critic of this program, I plan to monitor the transition of the National Rifle Board very closely. I have worked hard to get this boondoggle out of the Army and to eliminate its annual \$2.5 million appropriation. While not perfect, this provision is a big step in the right direction.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and commend the distinguished chairman of the House National Security Committee, Mr. Spence, the ranking minority member, Mr. DELLUMS and my colleagues on the House National Security Committee for bringing this important conference report to the House floor.

In particular, I want to thank Chairman SPENCE for his leadership in helping to ensure that the necessary funding has been provided to continue a very important program within the Department of the Army aimed at evaluating and embracing new weapons and munitions technology. Working with our colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee, Chairman SPENCE included in this year's national security conference report an additional \$3 million for program element 602624A, the Weapons and Munition Technology Program within the Department of the Army.

I am proud to report that much of the Army's Weapons and Munitions Technology Program is undertaken at the U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center [ARDEC] located at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

This program element within the Department of the Army undertakes several important initiatives designed to strengthen the Army's technology base by developing key technologies that will increase the lethality and survivability of future artillery weapons, munitions, and armaments for ground combat vehicles and aircraft.

It is my hope that with the additional funds authorized by Chairman SPENCE and his colleagues, Picatinny Arsenal will undertake a new era of investigation involving life-cycle assessment, a promising mechanism for managing future defense-related environmental challenges. To achieve advancements in life-cycle

weapons management, the Dean Gallo Center for Life-Cycle Environmental Technologies will be developed through a formal partnership between ARDEC and the New Jersey Institute of Technology [NJIT] in Newark, NJ. The purpose of the Gallo Center will be to conduct research, facilitate technology development, and to encourage industrial application of new methods and processes, new materials, and new technologies for meeting the clean manufacturing needs of both the military and the private sector.

I look forward to working with Chairman SPENCE and Mr. DELLUMS and members of the National Security Committee to ensure that this model program can play a valuable role in assisting DOD to manage current environmental challenges and develop new capabilities to meet future challenges.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I support the provisions to sell Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, better known as Elk Hills, that appear in H.R. 1530. I am particularly pleased that Congress is not only taking steps to ensure taxpayers get the maximum value for this asset but is finally dealing with California's long-standing interest in Elk Hills.

Elk Hills is in my congressional district and I know it intimately. I am pleased that the 104th Congress is finally dealing with the issue of ensuring that taxpayers get fair value for Elk Hills, something I have sought and in the past introduced legislation to seek. I am particularly pleased to see that the conferees set aside 9 percent of net proceeds, representing the proportion of oil produced by the school lands within the Federal Government's share of the Elk Hills reserve for possible compensation to California for its claims to lands within Elk Hills. California members of both parties have sought this kind of compensation during the last decade because the Federal Government never delivered on its promises to the State.

The history of Elk Hills makes it quite clear that California has a legitimate claim to compensation. California was granted sections of land throughout the State by Act of Congress in 1853 to support education, long before the creation of the reserve. The grant was identical to other grants made by the Federal Government to other States as they entered the union.

The Federal Government never delivered on the promise. Lands in Elk Hills were withdrawn in 1909 and 1912 for creation of the naval petroleum reserve. California never got appropriate compensation for its rights. Even after the Federal Government opened Elk Hills to production in 1976, ending any semblance of its use as a naval petroleum reserve, California's claim remained outstanding.

The importance of paying these claims has been recognized by Presidents and Members of this body during the past decade and I hope Congress will also choose to honor it. President Bush, after I met with officials in his administration, agreed to provide California with part of the bonuses and royalties from leasing Elk Hills. His 1992 budget explicitly said California would receive these payments and the essence of what he agreed to do was contained in a bill I introduced to facilitate leasing the reserve. President Clinton's own proposal to sell Elk Hills, submitted to the Speaker this spring, provides compensation for California.

Further, this issue goes beyond equity to the very heart of what our National Security

colleagues seek to accomplish by selling Elk Hills. Failing to recognize the equity of having the Federal Government live up to its obligations here could severely damage prospects for getting the maximum value out of Elk Hills for taxpayers. The State still regards its claim to the two sections as good. Once the Federal Government sells Elk Hills, there is no possible pretense that Elk Hills is a naval petroleum reserve.

California's claim clouds the title to Elk Hills and will discourage a bidder from offering full value for the reserve. Our State attorney general's office is confident the State has a claim that can be successfully pursued; the Federal court case that the State lost related to the State's claim that the naval petroleum reserve's status had been effectively extinguished by commercial production. That earlier suit did not deal with actual termination of the reserve's status through sale to private industry and the merits of the State's interest in these lands were never reached. Any potential buyer will take these matters into account and that in turn will hurt the taxpayers' interest. No bidder will want to be exposed to the risk of paying twice for the same asset.

The only way to avoid these problems is to do the right thing and provide a mechanism for fairly resolving the State's claims. The conference report does precisely that through a mechanism employing an escrow of net proceeds from a sale of Elk Hills.

The conference deals with the State's claims in a straight forward manner. Nine percent of the net sale proceeds are set aside in a special account for payment to California for its teachers retirement fund, which, by California law, is where the proceeds will go. The only way California could get any of the money would be to settle its claims with the United States or win a court case on this issue. An explicit settlement process, included in the bill prevents delays in bargaining by requiring the Federal Government to offer to settle California's claims within 30 days after the sale for what the Federal Government believes to be their fair market value. Taxpayers are fully protected here. Actual payments are subject to appropriations. Any funds not used to compensate California revert to the general fund. In fact, if no payment is made within 10 years, the whole fund reverts back to the Treasury. Most important, this process ends the cloud on Elk Hills' title resulting for the State claims because California can only be paid if it releases its claims to Elk Hills lands.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference agreement. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will tell you how much this report does for military personnel to improve their lives. Well, I rise to tell you what it does to military personnel.

This conference report violates the rights of women on military bases around the world by forbidding them to exercise their right to have an abortion they pay for themselves.

This conference report discriminates against people who are HIV positive, by forcing the military to discharge HIV positive personnel within 6 months of confirmation of their status. They would be discharged regardless of their competence, or current health.

The Department of Defense objects to this policy, as a loss of valuable man-hours. DOD has its own criteria for medical discharge, and will release these people when they cannot perform their duty any further.

Not only does the bill burden military personnel, it also makes it harder to balance the budget in future years. The \$7.1 billion increase above the President's request is a token down payment on hundreds of billions of dollars down the road.

Here are a few examples:

National missile defense was authorized \$853 million above the President's request for fiscal year 1996. CBO estimates that deployment of one system at one site could cost \$29 billion to complete. Adding an additional five sites would increase the cost by \$19 billion, not including operational and support costs for the program. Deploying this system at a single site is equivalent to 80 percent of the entire Defense research and development authorization for this fiscal year.

The B-2 bomber program received an increase of \$493 million just to keep the production line open, even though the plane has yet to meet many of its mission requirements in flight testing. To actually purchase the planes would cost us \$15 billion if we bought 20 more B-2's at a rate of 3 per year.

We cannot commit to this kind of spending and balance the budget. Vote "no" on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 267, nays 149, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 865]

YEAS—267

Abercrombie	Burr	DeLay
Allard	Burton	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Buyer	Dickey
Armey	Callahan	Doolittle
Bachus	Calvert	Dornan
Baesler	Campbell	Dreier
Baker (CA)	Canady	Duncan
Baker (LA)	Castle	Dunn
Baldacci	Chambliss	Durbin
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Edwards
Barr	Christensen	Ehlers
Barrett (NE)	Chrysler	Ehrlich
Bartlett	Clement	Emerson
Barton	Clinger	English
Bass	Clyburn	Ensign
Bateman	Coble	Everett
Bereuter	Coburn	Ewing
Bevill	Coleman	Fawell
Bilbray	Collins (GA)	Fields (TX)
Bilirakis	Combest	Flanagan
Bishop	Cooley	Foley
Bliley	Costello	Forbes
Boehlert	Cox	Ford
Boehner	Cramer	Fowler
Bonilla	Crane	Fox
Bono	Crapo	Franks (CT)
Boucher	Creameans	Frelinghuysen
Brewster	Cubin	Frisa
Browder	Cunningham	Frost
Brownback	Danner	Funderburk
Bryant (TN)	Davis	Gallagher
Bunn	de la Garza	Gekas
Bunning	Deal	Geren

Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)	Sanford
Gillmor	Linder	Saxton
Gilman	Lipinski	Scarborough
Gonzalez	Livingston	Schaefer
Goodlatte	Longley	Shiff
Goodling	Lucas	Scott
Goss	Manton	Seastrand
Graham	Manzullo	Shadegg
Greenwood	Matsui	Shaw
Hall (OH)	McCollum	Shuster
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Sisisky
Hamilton	McDade	Skeen
Hansen	McHugh	Skelton
Harman	McIntosh	Smith (MI)
Hastert	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Meek	Smith (WA)
Hayes	Metcalf	Solomon
Hayworth	Meyers	Souder
Hefley	Mica	Spence
Heineman	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Herger	Mink	Stenholm
Hilleary	Molinari	Stockman
Hobson	Montgomery	Stump
Hoekstra	Moorhead	Talent
Hoke	Myers	Tanner
Horn	Myrick	Tate
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Houghton	Ney	Taylor (MS)
Hoyer	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Hunter	Nussle	Tejeda
Hutchinson	Ortiz	Thomas
Hyde	Orton	Thompson
Inglis	Oxley	Thornberry
Istook	Packard	Thornton
Jefferson	Parker	Tiahrt
Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Torkildsen
Johnson, E. B.	Paxon	Torres
Johnson, Sam	Payne (VA)	Trafficant
Jones	Petri	Vucanovich
Kasich	Pickett	Waldholtz
Kelly	Pombo	Walker
Kennedy (RI)	Porter	Walsh
Kennelly	Portman	Wamp
Kim	Poshard	Ward
King	Radanovich	Waters
Kingston	Regula	Watts (OK)
Knollenberg	Richardson	Weldon (FL)
Kolbe	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
LaHood	Roberts	Weller
Largent	Rogers	White
Latham	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
Laughlin	Roth	Wolf
Lazio	Royce	Young (AK)
Leach	Salmon	Zeliff

NAYS—149

Andrews	Flake	Martini
Barcia	Foglietta	Mascara
Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Becerra	Franks (NJ)	McDermott
Beilenson	Furse	McHale
Bentsen	Ganske	McKinney
Berman	Gejdenson	Meehan
Blute	Gephardt	Menendez
Borski	Gibbons	Miller (CA)
Brown (CA)	Gordon	Minge
Brown (FL)	Green	Moakley
Brown (OH)	Gutknecht	Mollohan
Bryant (TX)	Hefner	Moran
Camp	Hilliard	Morella
Cardin	Hinchev	Murtha
Chabot	Holden	Nadler
Chapman	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Neumann
Clayton	(TX)	Oberstar
Collins (IL)	Jacobs	Obey
Collins (MI)	Johnson (SD)	Olver
Condit	Johnston	Owens
Conyers	Kanjorski	Pallone
Coyne	Kaptur	Payne (NJ)
DeLauro	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Dellums	Kildee	Peterson (FL)
Deutsch	Kleczka	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Klink	Pomeroy
Dingell	Klug	Rahall
Dixon	LaFalce	Ramstad
Doggett	Lantos	Rangel
Dooley	Levin	Reed
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Rivers
Engel	Lincoln	Roemer
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Rose
Evans	Lofgren	Roukema
Farr	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	Luther	Rush
Fazio	Maloney	Sabo
Fields (LA)	Markey	Sanders
Filner	Martinez	Sawyer

Schroeder	Studds	Waxman
Schumer	Stupak	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Thurman	Wilson
Serrano	Torricelli	Wise
Shays	Upton	Woolsey
Skaggs	Velazquez	Wyden
Shlaughter	Vento	Wynn
Spratt	Volkmer	Yates
Stark	Watt (NC)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Lewis (CA)	Quinn
Bonior	Lightfoot	Stokes
DeFazio	McInnis	Towns
Gunderson	Mfume	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Pryce	Young (FL)
Hancock	Quillen	

□ 1434

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. DeFazio against.
Mr. Lightfoot for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Towns against.

Messrs. FARR, SERRANO, and MOL-LOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. BECERRA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. DURBIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I see my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was going to seek recognition and yield to the majority leader, but he preempted me.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks by apologizing to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. I am sure he knows that it gave me no joy to do so.

Mr. HOYER. It does not give me much salve, Mr. Speaker, but I appreciate the observation.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the last scheduled vote for the day. I am sorry to tell the Members that I cannot

at this time make any definitive announcement with respect to the rest of the day. We have many things under consideration. It is possible that we will have another vote which would be, indeed, an important vote, before the day is over.

It is still our hope that we can find a basis by which we could expeditiously get to that point, to have that vote, and under conditions that the Members might feel comfortable with and be free to depart for their own districts for the weekend. We are working toward that objective, and as soon as we have the alternatives fully examined and brought out, we will come back either to present them or to make another announcement. So if the Members can please allow me to beg their indulgence we will, in just a few minutes, after some cleanup work, take a recess subject to the call of the Chair and try to get this done as quickly as we can.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the initial observation I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are very concerned that we stay in whatever negotiations are necessary to try to overcome this impasse and to accomplish the work that is before us. We are also very concerned, of course, that we give notice to the country and to its workers that they in fact will be working on Monday and that government will be operating on Monday.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not at some point in time today his side intends to offer a CR which will ensure that happening?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are working on different alternatives. Mr. Speaker, as you might guess, we were bitterly disappointed in the offer the President's team made today. We find the President's budget proposal to give us scant little with which to work. We do understand the stress of the circumstance that has been brought about by that meager offering. We do have a fairly good measure of the will of the body on both sides of the issue of the possible continuing resolution. We are trying to sort all that out and see what, if anything, we can present to the body before the day's end.

Mr. Speaker, we simply do not wish to make any definitive action until we are fully satisfied we have fully examined all of the options.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] have what we call a clean continuing resolution. Obviously, that would require unanimous consent. Obviously, neither would be recognized for the purposes of offering that unless there was agreement on both sides, but we on this side would hope that the leadership would seriously consider realizing that there were negotiations that went on some weekends ago when this impasse last occurred on November 13. Whether or not we can get that resolution up—

Mr. ARMEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the sentiment of the gentleman. I must say in all candor that the President's offering was so meager that I do not believe a clean continuing resolution is an option under consideration.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, as I understood it, his earlier announcement was that in a short period of time we would go into recess.

Is the gentleman planning to, along with that notification of recess, give us, give Members the notification time frame for which we will be back; in other words, 15 minutes, 2 hours, 1 hour? Or are we just dangling out here?

Mr. ARMEY. Obviously there will be a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, and we will work as quickly as we can, and certainly every Member will have the 15-minute notice.

Mr. VOLKMER. You are going to leave it at 15 minutes?

Mr. ARMEY. Fifteen.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], and myself and several others have proposed legislation that we understand was acceptable to the leadership that would avoid a situation that occurred last time we had a Government shutdown with Federal employees, where Federal employees were paid for not working. This legislation would ensure that at least they work and then be subsequently reimbursed. We understood that that might be put on an expeditious track.

Could the gentleman clarify that situation and give us some idea whether we would be able to expect that?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may clarify the situation, the gentleman's optimism, I am sure, is understandable. I think the gentleman, though, is excessively optimistic to report that the option that he referred to is acceptable to the leadership at this time, but I can report that it is one of the matters that is being considered. As soon as we can resolve it, we will be back with an announcement.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield again, there are a number of Members perhaps on both sides, I have not seen the list, who are interested in doing special orders, either 5-minute or hour special orders. I am wondering whether or not you intend, as we have done in the past, to go into special orders and then if we run out of special orders, to recess at that point in time? In other words, will there be a provision at the end of our business to allow for special orders?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that that is

a very difficult question to address, since we do not know exactly under what parliamentary basis we may end our business for the day. So let me just say I full respect the Members' interests in special orders, and we certainly would not engage in a parliamentary option that would have as an objective to prevent special orders. It is not inconceivable that special orders could be, or the loss of special orders could be, the consequence of a necessary parliamentary method that we may use later, so again, I would just ask the gentleman if he could just be patient and trust me. We will try to get it worked out.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I respect the gentleman and like him. I want him to know that I continue that.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, before I suffer any more abuse, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields back his time, my point was that historically, in many instances, what we do is we go to special orders while we wait for the negotiations or other items to go on. If special orders concludes and there is still a reason that the majority would want to stay here pending negotiations, or perhaps come back to the floor to do additional legislative business, to have that time filled up by Members on both sides of the aisle going back and forth who want to do special orders.

□ 1445

My question was a legitimate question, since as we do have Members who had signed up to do special orders, whether or not they might accomplish that objective within the time frame that we are waiting for the negotiations or other decisions to be made by the leadership.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I will get back to the gentleman on that.

Mr. Speaker, for the time being, at least, let me yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF AU PAIR PROGRAMS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2767) to extend au pair programs, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I am pleased that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and I were able to work on this bill to extend the authority of USIA to run the au pair program for another 2 years, and I yield to the gentleman to explain the bill.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the opportunity to bring to the floor H.R. 2767, a 2-year extension of the au pair program. I know this is a program of interest to a number of our Members, many of whom have heard from their constituents that have been affected by the expiration of the program. Through a bipartisan effort, we have cleared the way to quickly pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the key role that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the distinguished ranking member of the House Committee on International Relations, played in drafting the bill and moving it through the committee. I urge the support of H.R. 2767.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, with regard to this bill, I want to rise in support of the extension of the au pair program for 2 more years under the auspices of the United States Information Agency. I know that this is a minor issue in the context of a much more important issue with regard to the Government shutdown, but many Members have asked us to bring forward this bill.

The program, a very successful cultural program, not only benefits young people wishing to learn more about the United States, but it benefits also a great many families throughout the country in providing important child care and the opportunity to learn from the au pair about the traditions and cultural differences in their home country.

Now, I understand that Mr. JOHNSTON and others have some concern over whether this is a family-friendly measure, with some very attractive au pairs coming from Scandinavian countries, particularly. I do not think that is a particular reason to oppose the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we pass this legislation today because it would expire otherwise. We have many families across the country that have been left hanging, waiting for their au pair to arrive, so they are trying to find temporary child care, hoping that it will not have a negative impact on their children. Many families, particularly with two parents working, are struggling to make ends meet and are dependent upon these au pairs. The visas cannot be issued to these young people until Congress passes this legislation.

It is really not fair to them in other European allied countries that have tried to participate in this program months ago to have their visas held because of congressional inaction. They

leave their jobs, they move from their apartments when they are accepted into the program. So I would urge my colleagues to support this bill to extend the au pair program and stop the uncertainty facing many American families.

I understand there is greater uncertainty facing a greater number of families that I would hope we could deal with as well, but there is no reason to object to this legislation, and I would urge its consideration and passage.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me inquire, do I understand this is a unanimous-consent request where you are asking everyone in good faith, in goodwill, to permit you to take up this measure to continue a statute that is about to expire; is that right?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct. It is a unanimous-consent request because it does expire on the 30th of this month.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman from Maryland, just before you arose, was asking for the same type of good faith and goodwill with regard to the standard procedure in this body when we recess, giving other Members an opportunity to get up on special orders and have their say with reference to what is occurring here.

I am wondering if we could have any more guidance as to whether, when we complete this measure, we will have that opportunity, if we showed good faith and goodwill with reference to this unanimous consent request, if there will be an opportunity for Members on both sides of the aisle to have their say this afternoon about some of the things that are occurring here, or whether we are to be muzzled.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman would yield, I regret that I cannot speak for the leadership with regard to the special orders.

Mr. DOGGETT. You are going to inquire about that?

Mr. GILMAN. I think the inquiry was made, and if the gentleman would further yield, I believe the inquiry was made and the majority leader said he would get back to us with the answer.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is what I am concerned about, through he is an amicable fellow and a fellow Texan, I do not know what he means by that. He may mean never.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from Texas in making a similar kind of inquiry. The normal procedure has been that when we do go into recess, that we all, in a bipartisan way, on both sides of the

aisle, have the opportunity to go into special orders; and sometimes we have a dialog amongst all of us, and sometimes we just share the time. But it would seem to me that that is the procedure that we ought to follow here so that in fact we are not sitting around here doing nothing while we are waiting for the opportunity to come back and find out what the rest of the schedule is going to be, and that people in the peoples House have that opportunity to make known their concerns, their interests, and take this time, which I think we all agree is used usefully on behalf of both parties.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I want it crystal-clear on the record that I want special orders tonight. I have an hour on Bosnia; some of your Members are going to join me, and if you would like to form some kind of unofficial ad hoc committee of three, I will join you in the name of freedom of speech. I was in the minority for 16 years.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman who has often utilized that freedom of speech to provide some of the more interesting special orders here, and perhaps as we carry on this reservation with some discussion about the implications of doing this, you can get some indication from your leadership whether both sides will have that opportunity.

Mr. DORNAN. Form an ad hoc committee. I have the key to the Speaker's door, and we will go down and see him.

Mr. DOGGETT. He has never given me that key, but I invite your doing that, because I think there are going to be some other people that want to be heard on my reservation, and I cannot yield the floor on this point, but I think we will be here long enough to give you time to get some answer.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with great interest to the gentleman's reservation, and I think he is making an excellent point, and I am pleased to see this Doggett-Dornan alliance.

Mr. DOGGETT. It is the second time this week, although Mr. DORNAN may not know it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, since you have to stay here, I would hope that maybe Mr. DORNAN would take his key and go find his leadership. I do not think anyone over here has a key, but if he could go find his leadership, that would be very, very helpful. Maybe he can come back and a lot of us can keep talking about how bad it is that we are constantly gagged over here, and one more time, we are going to be gagged if the gentleman from California cannot find them.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DOGGETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members can no longer reserve the right to object on the request for regular order.

Members must object or not object.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOGGETT. In that regard then, if I am no longer able to do my reservation and I make objection at this time, will the gentleman be able to make his unanimous consent request again later in the day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can entertain that request later if the gentleman is withdrawing his reservation.

Mr. DOGGETT. No; I am not withdrawing. I am going to make an objection, if that is the case.

I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

□ 1500

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENTSEN. Under the rules of the House, is only one Member allowed to reserve the right to object to a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any Member may demand regular order. At that point, the Chair must put the unanimous-consent request to the office immediately.

Mr. BENTSEN. So a demand for regular order is superior to a reservation of a right to object?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from Texas has objected.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1845. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the semiannual report on

activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1846. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting memorandum of justification regarding certification that Russia and the Commonwealth of Independent States continue to make substantial progress toward withdrawal of their armed forces from Latvia and Estonia, pursuant to Public Law 103-87, section 577(b) (107 Stat. 973); jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

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. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2402. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands in the State of Utah at Snowbasin Ski Area; with an amendment (Rept. 104-409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1816. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than January 3, 1996.

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. SKAGGS (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. MCHALE):

H.R. 2785. A bill to repeal section 18 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CREMEANS:

H.R. 2786. A bill to provide for the modification of the reversionary interest retained by the United States as part of the conveyance of certain real property to Lawrence County, OH; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2787. A bill to repeal the price support programs and related acreage allotment and marketing quota programs for agricultural commodities, to repeal marketing orders issued to regulate the handling of certain agricultural commodities, and to establish a special fund to assist farmers whose annual net income from all sources is less than \$30,000; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2788. A bill to provide that if a member nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or Japan does not agree, by the end of fiscal year 1997, to assume the full nonpersonnel costs of United States military forces permanently stationed ashore in that country, all such United States Forces assigned in that country shall be withdrawn not later than the end of fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the estab-

lishment of an intercity passenger rail trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Mrs. LINCOLN:

H.R. 2790. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to authorize States to impose fees for the initial certification and survey of health care facilities in order to provide for timely certification of these facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid Programs; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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. MANTON:

H.R. 2791. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to limit funds to States that do not enact laws that require a test to detect the presence of the etiologic agent for acquired immune deficiency syndrome in certain cases of assault; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2792. A bill to direct the head of each Federal agency to designate space in each Federal building owned or leased for use by the agency for the display of posters of missing children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, House Oversight, Government Reform and Oversight, and 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.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 2793. A bill to provide for the establishment and funding of a conservation incentives program to assist farmers and ranchers in developing and implementing conservation practices to protect soil, water, and related resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H.R. 2794. A bill to extend and improve the price support and production adjustment program for peanuts, to establish standards for the inspection, handling, storage, and labeling of all peanuts and peanut products sold in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, 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. SHAW (for himself, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 2795. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 and the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify the definitions of domestic industry and like articles in certain investigations involving perishable agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOLINARI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 2796. A bill to require the surgical removal of silicone gel and saline filled breast implants, to provide for research on silicone

and other chemicals used in the manufacture of breast implants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 2797. A bill to abolish the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the House of Representatives, establish an Independent Commission on Congressional Ethics, and provide for the transfer of the duties and functions of the Committee to the Independent Commission; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 2798. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise certain authorities relating to management and contracting in the provision of health care services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 2799. A bill to designate certain National Forest lands in the State of Montana as wilderness, to release other National Forest lands in the State of Montana for multiple use management, and for other purposes; 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. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. HOKE):

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution supporting the independence and sovereignty of Ukraine and the progress of its political and economic reforms; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution urging the President of the United States to seek negotiations with the Republic of Ireland, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and international financial institutions for the purpose of establishing an Ireland Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Mr. HOKE, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H. Res. 308. Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that President Clinton should ask for the resignation of Hazel O'Leary as Secretary of Energy and the General Accounting Office should investigate her travel practices as Secretary of Energy; to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 109: Mr. COOLEY.

H.R. 776: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 785: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 862: Mr. COOLEY.

H.R. 885: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1124: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1129: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1256: Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1279: Mr. BURR, Mr. DORNAN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1733: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. FLANAGAN.

H.R. 1950: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. HILLIARD, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2090: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 2245: Mr. MCKINNEY and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2310: Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2333: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. HILLEARY.
 H.R. 2335: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 2407: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EVANS, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2429: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WISE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GORDON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 2531: Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. COBURN.
 H.R. 2548: Ms. RIVERS.
 H.R. 2579: Mr. FOX, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. DUNN of Washington.
 H.R. 2654: Ms. FURSE, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 2657: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 2676: Mr. FROST and Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 2701: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2729: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 2740: Mr. DORNAN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 2772: Mr. BALLENGER.
 H.R. 2778: Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr.

WHITFIELD, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KING, Mr. METCALF, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 2779: Mr. TALENT and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2780: Mr. DAVIS.
 H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. WALSH.
 H. Res. 220: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. MARKEY.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1710

OFFERED BY: MR. MANZULLO

[Page and line numbers correspond to those of H.R. 2703, as introduced]

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 4, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 16 on page 54.

Page 63, strike line 8 and all that follows through line 25 on page 176.

Redesignate the remaining provisions accordingly.

Amend the table of contents accordingly.

H.R. 1710

OFFERED BY: MR. QUINN

[Page and line numbers correspond to those of H.R. 2703, as introduced]

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end, add the following new title:

TITLE X—EXPLOSIVES CONTROLS

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Restricted Explosive Control Act of 1995".

SEC. 1002. PROHIBITION AGAINST THE DISTRIBUTION OR RECEIPT OF RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES WITHOUT A FEDERAL PERMIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 842 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting "that are not restricted explosives" after "explosive materials" the 2nd place such term appears; and

(ii) by striking "or" after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C) and inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) to distribute restricted explosives to any person other than a licensee or permittee; or"; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated), by inserting "that are not restricted explosives" after "explosive materials"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting "if the explosive materials are not restricted explosives," before "a resident".

(b) RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES DEFINED.—Section 841 of such title, is amended by section 501 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(r) 'Restricted explosives' means high explosives, blasting agents, detonators, and more than 50 pounds of black powder."

SEC. 1003. REQUIREMENT THAT APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL EXPLOSIVES LICENSE OR PERMIT INCLUDE A PHOTOGRAPH AND SET OF FINGERPRINTS OF THE APPLICANT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 843(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by inserting "shall include the applicant's photograph and set of fingerprints, which shall be taken and transmitted to the Secretary by the chief law enforcement officer of the applicant's place of residence, and" before "shall be".

(b) CHIEF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER DEFINED.—Section 841 of such title, as amended by sections 501 and 1002(b) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) 'Chief law enforcement officer' means the chief of police, the sheriff, or an equivalent officer or the designee of any such individual."

SEC. 1004. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply to conduct engaged in after the 180-day period that begins with the date of the enactment of this Act.