(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.

Te 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.

This bill is $7 billion above the President's request, and nearly $1 billion 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 met 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 gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me digress just a second to remind the gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman will continue to yield, I would say to the gentlewoman 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 gentlewoman 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 of 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-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 Soviet 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 conceivable 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. THORNBERRY], an outstanding member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. THORNBERRY. 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 than.

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 ghettoes 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 casualities. 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
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—29

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

NOT VOTING—26

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

☐ 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.