

The thing is, get your work done, present these policy questions honestly, do not try to cement these provisions and advantages in place to cut Medicare, and to cut education, and the other programs that are so important to American families.

The Gingrich Republican theme change is not going to work. The American people understand what is at the base of the goals no matter how you hide them and note the whining by the Speaker, because he was not treated right on Air Force One. The poll numbers speak for themselves, the American people are not with the Gingrich Republicans. You do not have the economics or the public opinion on your side. So let us pass a truly clean resolution and get on with the real work of this Congress and pass a just budget.

ELIMINATE THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about essential and nonessential Federal employees. Many of my constituents are asking why the Federal Government hires employees who are not essential in the first place. I did not.

The Department of Commerce recently sent two-thirds of its employees home because they were deemed nonessential. My bill to dismantle the Commerce Department only eliminated one-third. I guess I did not go far enough, but that is because I am conservative and not extreme.

A recent survey by the Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce in my home State of Michigan indicated 89 percent of the business leaders there support the dismantling of the department. Business Week magazine agreed by a 2-to-1 margin. When the Clinton administration, former Commerce Secretaries, Michigan business leaders, and the Nation's senior business executives all agree that most of the Department of Commerce is nonessential, then it is time to put the Department of Commerce out of business.

MEMBERS SHOULD NOT BE DENIGRATED

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I count myself among the majority in the House who agree that none of us should denigrate any Member of this House, and I personally think that includes showing charts that denigrate Members of this House.

I thought it was therefore ironic when Speaker GINGRICH complained about his seat on Air Force One. We all understand, I believe, that the hallmark of his membership in this House

has been verbal abuse, and the denigration of this President and Democratic-elected officials. NEWT GINGRICH has used these words about President Clinton, a previous Speaker of this House, or other Democrats: Sick, nuts, traders, corrupt, thugs. We all remember how he referred to the First Lady of the land. Frankly, NEWT GINGRICH is lucky to even get invited to ride on Air Force One.

GIFT BAN AND LOBBY DISCLOSURE

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on another note, today we will be taking up Gift Ban and Lobby Disclosure, two bills that were passed by the Senate a number of months ago. My plea to this Chamber is that on a bipartisan basis we can pass both bills. I salute the Democrats for pushing these issues before the Chamber, and my Republican colleagues who want to move forward.

I encourage them to vote against the Burton amendment, which, in my view, is a gutting amendment, and will keep things basically the way they are. I encourage them to support the Senate proposal or even better, a total ban, as the Speaker has proposed. On lobby disclosure, we need no amendment to that bill; we can send it on to the President. I understand a number of my colleagues on the Democratic side want to send it to the President. I encourage a number on my side to oppose any amendment and finally get lobbyists to register.

STATUS REPORT NEEDED FROM COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

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

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Today, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON] and I will introduce a privileged resolution calling for a report from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct concerning the standing complaints against Speaker GINGRICH in that committee. Those complaints have been languishing in that committee for over 14 months. We have no intention to prejudice the outcome of the investigation, nor do we set a timetable for action. We only ask for a status report.

Mr. Speaker, it has been rumored that the majority leader will move to table this resolution today. We hope that we have a good debate on this issue and a vote on this resolution. I remind the Members of this House, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is our committee. It does not belong to the Speaker. They owe it to us to have a report as to the findings of their work.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 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 (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

House Resolution 271 is a straightforward resolution. The proposed rule merely waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. This resolution was reported out of the Committee on Rules by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, members of this House often stand on the floor and debate whether various programs should be conducted by Federal, State, or even local government. However, Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that the State governments cannot do, or one thing the local governments cannot do, that is to provide for the national defense, the national security, and the intelligence requirements of the United States of America. The Congress and the President, as Commander in Chief, alone have this obligation. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule. As every Member is fully aware, this is the second conference agreement on the Department of Defense appropriation. And, while not every Member will agree with every provision in this conference report, the conferees have attempted to address at least one of the major objections to the original report, that being the question of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware that the original conference report was defeated because of opposition from those Members who felt funding levels were too high, as well as those Members who opposed the provisions relating to the abortion. The conferees have

modified the abortion language to only allow the procedure to be performed in military hospitals in the cases of rape, incest, and to save the life of the mother. This action has thus removed an objection voiced by at least some of the opponents of the original conference report. While I would have preferred that the conference report maintain its original language on this matter, I do support the conference report and I would urge all Members to do likewise.

The provisions of this report track closely those originally passed by the House and deserve our support. I do not have to tell any Member how important it is to pass this appropriations bill. And, I need not remind Members of our responsibility to act on each and every one of the remaining appropriations bills in order that the Federal Government might be funded for the fiscal year. In spite of the passage of a short-term continuing resolution by the House last night, which may very well be vetoed, we must continue to press forward to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats want to solve this impasse. And I cannot deny that my Republican colleagues share that goal. We—Democrats and Republicans—can go a long way toward resolving this situation by passing this conference report this morning.

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

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what we are about to do in this House. Last night, amid much pontificating, this House told the American people that we were going to be committed to balancing the budget within 7 years. Today, as the very first legislative act after that promise, we are being asked to vote for an appropriation bill which adds \$7 billion to the President's budget.

That money does not go to the troops. That money does not go to readiness. Because if we in fact take a look at what is happening in this bill on O&M, the major readiness account, it is actually lower than the President's for that account by half a billion dollars, once we deduct Coast Guard funding, which is really a transportation function, once we deduct the adjustment that was made on inflation in this bill but not made on the estimates in the President's budget, and that adjustment should have been made in both legislative vehicles, and once we deduct the contingency fund, \$650 million.

This added money is put largely in 3 areas: One is in procurement; well, it is put in two areas largely, procurement and pork.

On procurement, this committee is insisting that we go ahead with the congressional demand to buy 40 B-2

bombers even though the Pentagon itself only wants 20. The cost of one of those bombers is about \$1.2 billion. That would pay the undergraduate tuition for every single student at the University of Wisconsin for the next 11 years.

We are being asked to buy the F-22, years early, at a total cost eventually of \$70 billion. And people say, oh, we need this, we need a strong defense. Well, of course we need a strong defense, but this chart demonstrates what has happened to our military budget versus Russia's since the Berlin Wall fell.

The red chart shows that the Russian military budget has dropped by about 70 percent. The United States military budget, by that same token, has dropped by about 10 percent. That is hardly reacting to reality.

People say, well, we have to worry about somebody besides Russia. Okay. Let us take every single threat that has been suggested to the United States, from Russia, from China, from Syria, Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, that well-known military powerhouse, Cuba. Add all of the money together, and you know what? We still outspend them militarily by 2½ times. That does not count our NATO allies, and you know, the last time I looked, they were on our side.

So we are being asked to provide this huge bill, yet we are being asked to cut back on housing, cut back on education. We are being asked to squeeze the life's blood out of Social Security and Medicaid, knock hundreds of thousands of Americans out of health insurance because of Medicaid.

This is indeed where the rubber hits the road. Last night was a nice generic promise, but today you have an opportunity to demonstrate whether you were serious or whether you are going to blow a hole in that promise one day after you made it.

This country cannot afford to spend \$7 billion more than President Clinton wants us to spend on the military budget, if it intends to get to a balanced budget in 7 years. If anybody believes you can do that, you are smoking something that ain't legal.

So I would urge you to recognize reality, recognize that if you are going to make the tough choices that were talked about last night, you might as well start now. You might as well start on this bill. We ought to vote this bill down and keep it down until we get a bill back that reflects the financial crisis which the House declared we were in last night.

I urge Members to vote against this bill. I have talked to the President's chief of staff, 15 minutes ago, and he has told me he is going to veto this bill. There is no sense sending this bill to him. It is a mission in futility. We cannot afford it. We should not be engaged in wasted motion. This bill is a dead duck, and it ought to be.

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

I would suggest to the gentleman that just preceded me that to reduce the defense budget in the proportions that he is talking about means we are going to have to have fairly dramatic cuts in personnel. Obviously the largest expenditure in the defense budget is personnel. It is a little ironic to hear the gentleman on one night speaking about how the deficit is making Federal employees be furloughed and the next day suggesting huge cuts in personnel in the military budget.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. I would like to correct a statement just made by the previous speaker. The fact is the President's budget does not contain any reductions in personnel. We are not asking for any reductions in personnel. We are asking for reductions in the F-22, the B-2, we are asking for reductions in procurement items. We are not asking for one dime in reduction in personnel.

You have said it—not you but people on your side have said it time and time again. It does not matter how many times you say it. You are wrong each time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. McINNIS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

If the gentleman is going to get any kind of cuts proportionate to the comparisons on those charts that he is making with Russia, tell me how you are going to get those kinds of cuts by just cutting out the B-2 bomber. You cannot do it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. What proportion is the gentleman talking about? I am not suggesting we cut our budget the same as Russia.

Mr. McINNIS. Why is the gentleman using the chart?

Mr. OBEY. I am using the chart to show that we can afford, given the fact that we spent 2½ times as much as our enemies, we can afford to hold the budget to the amount the President has asked for. That is \$7 billion out of a more than \$250 billion budget. That is hardly a big slasher.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, this is a very important debate, because we have been told that we can balance the budget within 7 years and we should vote for that concept of a balanced budget within 7 years and then we can debate how to do it.

But if you pass this appropriations bill today with the excessive and unnecessary procurement that is in it, that the gentleman from Wisconsin has talked about, if you commit to the weapon systems he talked about in

those numbers, then you are guaranteeing that if you balance the budget within 7 years, you will drastically reduce spending for a whole lot of areas.

We are in a zero sum game. We all agree that the budget is going to be balanced. There is some question about when. But this is partly why some of us have a problem with being told, "Well, just agree to a balanced budget in 7 years and then we can work it out."

If this appropriation passes, we are committed to a level of expenditure for weapon systems procurements in the tens of billions that will inevitably have to come out of other programs.

What we have is the worst case of cultural lag I have ever seen. For more than 50 years, the United States sensibly led the free world to defend against enemies who were powerful enough to deprive us of our freedom. Fortunately, today in the world, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has documented, we do not have any threat to our physical existence. Yes, it would be convenient to do this, it would be beneficial to do that, but there is a qualitative difference.

What we have here is the old cold war argument where our survival was at stake. Now we have had a transfer. We are not talking about survival. Indeed, people on the other side are opposed to many of the uses for the military. We have the paradox where people on the other side want to spend more and more on the military and use it less and less. I think there is reason to use it less and less.

My final point is this: This is the real foreign aid bill. More money is spent by U.S. taxpayers through this bill to subsidize the economies of other nations than in the foreign aid bill many times over, except that we do not have poor nations here. This is a subsidy to wealthy nations.

The military budgets of Japan and Germany and England and France and Denmark and Norway and the other wealthy nations are a fraction of what they should be. Yesterday's, Tuesday's New York Times has an article about a book which says one reason the rapidly increasingly prosperous Asian nations have done so well is that America has, for free, provided them with defense. So we subsidize their defense while they build up big trade surpluses. We continue, in this bill, the pattern of greatly excessive spending, not for America's military security but in part as a form of foreign aid to the wealthy nations of Europe and Asia.

As a consequence, if you pass this bill, you get into a situation where every dollar spent for the B-2 bomber, for unneeded weapons, weapons the Pentagon does not want, it is only logical it has to come out of medical care, out of education. It is why the Republicans are voting to raise the rents of older people in public housing, which is part of their legislative package.

If we adopt this conference report, we then make it very clear that a balanced budget will consist in substan-

tial part of excessive spending on the military, subsidies to the budgets of Western Europe, subsidies to the budgets of our Asian trading partners. So we defend them, and in return we will make up for those subsidies by cutting medical care, cutting education, cutting housing. It is a very bad deal.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the benefits of this job is the excitement that we get when we have the opportunity to engage in general debate. But I am a little curious. The gentleman from Massachusetts of course has the opportunity to vote "no" on the conference report, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is going to have an opportunity certainly to engage in bringing his points forward in general debate.

I would yield to the gentleman for an answer to the question: Do you have an objection to the rule passed on voice vote up in the Committee on Rules?

This is the rules debate. Do you have an objection, and the same with the gentleman from Wisconsin, to the specific rule?

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would say two things.

First, I am debating now because we only have an hour on the overall bill, so I am glad to sue the debate time.

But do I have an objection to the rule? In this sense, no rule, no bill. So I object to the rule because of the company it keeps, and if the rule is going to hang around with a bill like that, it is going to damage its reputation.

I would ask the gentleman from Colorado, who has the time, if he would yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time and yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for asking that question. The fact is that when this bill was before us originally, we had a time limit imposed that prevented us from raising many of the issues that we wanted to raise at that time. So the only time we have had an opportunity to raise these issues has been on the rule today. When we deal with the conference report shortly, we will only have about 20 minutes during which we can explain our concerns about the bill. So that is why we are taking the time on the rule to explain our concerns about the bill.

Mr. MCINNIS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman still has not answered the question: When the final tally comes, do you object to the rule?

I yield for a response to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I frankly accept the fact that the rule is going to pass. I am simply legitimately using the rule on the bill to discuss what is at stake. In my view what we ought to do is defeat the rule so that this bill can go back to committee and get fixed.

□ 1130

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. This rule obviously would not be necessary with an appropriation bill if we were following the proper procedure, but that seems to be sort of forgotten in the actions of this House in this session.

I rise in opposition to this because I think it is fundamentally a question of misplaced priorities in terms of this Congress and our budgets. The fact is that we do not need just smart weapons in this Nation in order to defend our national security. We need smart people. We need smart soldiers and sailors not just smart weapons.

Look what is happening in this budget. Look at what is happening. We are disinvesting in our total budget in people, in education programs. We are taking the House budget that was passed, removed \$10 billion in the next 7 years from scholarships and assistance in terms of education at a time when, you know, the world of work is changing; the world of national security is changing.

What does this bill do? This bill tips the balance in terms of weapons systems. The weapons systems that have tentacles that stretch into every State in this Nation, all of us have employers and some jobs that are related to putting the weapon systems together. But who is going to run those systems?

Economists will tell you, if you want to make your national economy work, you need to have capital, you need to have research and you have to have investment in people. You have to have human resource.

What is happening in our military today is they basically have to take on this task of training themselves. What this bill does is cuts the operation and maintenance budget. You buy all sorts of new weapons systems. In order to keep them bill does is cuts the operation and maintenance budget you buy all sorts of new weapons systems. In order to keep them in the air, keep them functioning, you have to cannibalize those particular aircraft, those weapons systems, to keep them going because of shortfalls in operations and maintenance.

What do you do in terms of the maintenance for the systems. Then there is the question of operation. Who is going to operate them? We have to take up the training task, when we do not have recruits and individuals that have the ability to do the job we will have problems, in the security of this Nation.

So the fact is you shortchange by overload the appropriation with more weapons systems and too little operations and maintenance. You are shortchanging the operations and maintenance. We all know we can end up buying an aircraft carrier, we can end up buying more B-2 bombers. Who is going to take care of them? They are not going to be readiness ready. They are

not going to have a readiness factor in terms of being ready to serve the function in the field. It has been pointed out that in years past, the past 50 years, one could arguably state that we needed the high defense spending many nuclear weapons and other types of weapons systems. That argument, in light of what has happened in recent years, you cannot escape what is the demise of the cold war is not relevant has occurred today.

These weapons systems are becoming obsolete as we go forward. We are setting a policy path to build more of them in a world environment where many of these sophisticated weapons systems, and I am pleased they will not be used, I hope they will not be used, we cannot use them, but it is a time in history where we need to call on others around the globe to start picking up their own responsibility in terms of their own national defense.

The weapons systems and sophisticated systems that have been under our control in the past are not applicable to many of the situations we have, whether in the former Yugoslavia, whether in North Africa, whether in many other place of conflict around the globe.

It is time, I think, to say "no," to say we do not want this continued American buildup and spendup. We need to bring this in line. We have to bring this in line, in other words, to get into the retrenchment and realignment—the downsizing of the U.S. military budgets.

Yesterday, in Minnesota, 3M Co., which headquarters is in my district, announced the fact they were going to eliminate 5,000 jobs from their company, many of them jobs in Minnesota, good jobs. The fact is that the U.S. military should be facing the same plight we have given them the time, we have given them the dollars.

If these dollars were being spent on a builddown, if they were being spent only on the base realignment and closing and actually moving forward in terms of building it down so we could have a soft landing for many of the people in the military, that would be one thing.

But that is not what this measure is doing. What you are doing is you are shortchanging, you are shortchanging the operation and maintenance in these type of adjustment dollars that should be present. They have been stripped out of this bill. They are no longer there to help the communities that are impacted. The Nunn-Lugar program to take a part the former Soviet nuclear facilities isn't funded.

That is why I am rising today. You have abandoned that particular process in Russia and in terms of our American communities so that we can get to this with less pain and less risk.

We would like to work with you and help you, but this bill does not do it, and it deserves to be defeated today on this floor.

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

gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

I did not intend to be involved in the debate on the rule, because that is not what this debate is even about. This is a good rule, a bipartisan rule. We ought to just go ahead and expedite the rule and get to the conference report.

But I really cannot leave unchallenged the issue that we reduced readiness. That is just totally erroneous. We reduced some of the operations and maintenance accounts. That is correct. In fact, we reduced these particular accounts by about \$1.7 billion.

Let me tell you where we reduced. Then I want to tell you where we added back for readiness. We reduced the technology reinvestment program. It may be a good program, but it should not necessarily be funded by the Department of Defense. That is one of the reductions that this previous speaker talked about.

We reduced consultants and research centers by \$90 million. You know, they refer to them as Beltway Bandits sometimes. We cut that.

The Nunn-Lugar funding to convert Soviet, former Soviet, military industries, well, our understanding is that a lot of that conversion went to a new type of Russian military industry. So we took the money out of that.

The U.N. peacekeeping assessment, \$65 million; we should pay our peacekeeping assessments, but it should not come out of this bill. It ought to come out of the State Department bill or it ought to come out of the foreign aid bill, but not the Defense bill.

Another large reduction, \$129 million for travel, support aircraft operations. We made these reductions because of Members on that side of the aisle who asked us to do it, and we agreed to those amendments. So, yes, we did make those kinds of reductions.

What did we add back for real readiness and quality-of-life issues for our personnel? We added over \$2 billion. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] does not like me to repeat this, but I will. We did provide money for the pay raise for the members of the military.

We added funds for housing allowances for members of the military.

We added \$322 million to upgrade barracks facilities that are a tragedy. People who might have to go to war and risk their lives should not have to live like that.

We added \$170 million for training shortfalls, training moneys that had been borrowed in advance for other contingency operations that had not been approved by Congress, incidentally.

We created a new initiative that even the President thinks is a good idea now, paying for the known contingency operations as we go, to deny access to the air of Saddam Hussein's air forces and to provide comfort for those non-Saddam supporters in Iraq.

We added \$647 million for that because that contingency is ongoing, and we ought to pay for it as we go. We ought to be up front and be honest.

So the truth is, yes, we did reduce the operations and maintenance accounts on one hand but we increased them by adding real readiness and quality-of-life on the other hand, and I think that, as we discuss these issues, we really ought to be accurate, and I will do my very best and I know my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], will, to make sure the debate remains as accurate as possible.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member for many, many good things in this piece of legislation.

But let me also say there are things in here which I find very troubling. We are in the midst of a budget deficit debate here which involves almost impossible choices of things that we have to cut. There are proposals from the Republican side of the aisle for deep cuts in the Medicare Program, deep cuts in programs providing health care for poor children, for elderly people in nursing homes, cuts in education programs, cuts in environmental programs. And here we have a bill where we are being asked to spend \$7 billion more than the administration requested.

Let me focus on one particular item of expenditure, the B-2 bomber. The B-2 bomber was designed to fight the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, as we knew it, no longer exists, and yet the contractor that builds the planes has enough political muscle in the House of Representatives to force us to add in this bill 20 new B-2 bombers at a cost of \$31 billion.

Let me tell you about the B-2 bomber. First, it does not work. This bomber, despite the money we have invested in it, its radar cannot tell the difference between a cloud and a mountain. Now, that is a very difficult problem facing a pilot when you cannot tell the difference.

Second, it costs too much, at least \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion per plane.

Third, we do not need it, since the Soviet Union is gone.

And, fourth, the Pentagon says they do not want it. But we are still pressing forward with this defense pork barrel for one contractor, \$31 billion.

We have to make choices in politics. Let me tell you what I would do with the \$31 billion. Personally, I would more than double the investment we make each year in the National Institutes of Health medical research. I honestly believe that families across America would feel much more secure at home knowing that we are spending money looking for a cure for cancer, looking for a cure for AIDS, fighting diseases which ravage families across

America and around the world. That is a much more important investment than more B-2 bombers.

Second, I would make certain we do not make the education cut called for by the Gingrich Republicans. They want to cut college student loans by \$10 billion while we are building these B-2 bombers. Kids from working families find it tough enough to afford college today. The Republicans are increasing the cost of that college education. Take the \$10 billion they would cut, put it into college education.

And, finally, I would give full deductibility to self-employed people, I am talking about small businesses here and farmers, for their health insurance. More and more Americans are starting their own businesses, and that is good for our economy. The biggest single problem they face is the cost of health care. We allow big corporations to duck the full cost. Small companies should be allowed to.

You do those three things with the B-2 bomber money, and I think this country is better off.

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

First of all, I think that the previous speaker points out that the President's budget that this conference report comes out above that, I think he should kind of paint the entire picture.

No. 1, this conference report is \$746 million less than the House report. No. 2, nearly \$400 million less than the bill that we passed a year ago.

Paint the entire picture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois and I have always gotten along. He is a good, robust debater. I like to think I am, too.

But we must be very careful on health issues not to give false hope to people across this country on the AIDS crisis that has now killed more young men in the prime of life than died in combat in World War II. There will never be a cure for the AIDS virus.

I called Dr. Tony Fauci, the head man up at National Institutes of Health. We have to get saying this correctly. We can only hope for a vaccine to keep the humano-immunodeficiency virus locked inside the T-cells for the rest of your life, but once that virus is inside that microscopic T-cell, it is never coming out.

Dr. Fauci himself has slipped over the years. I called him, and he apologizes. The word c-u-r-e can never be applied to the AIDS plague. We hope for a vaccine to extend peoples' lives.

Mr. MCINNIS. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask the gentleman's position on the bill?

Mr. DORNAN. I am going to support this bill because of what the gentleman from Illinois missed is the importance of a balanced defense budget in harmony with domestic budgets. However, I will fight like hell for reportability on rape in the military. If a woman or

a dependent is raped, how can any Senator tell me that when the Uniform Code of Military Justice is violated, you do not have to report who raped you for your trip home? Outrageous. Never again. This time, yes.

□ 1145

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

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

Mr. Speaker, with all this gray hair and 23 years on the Committee on National Security, let us talk about this budget. At a time when dollars are so precious, this thing is \$7 billion more than the Joint Chiefs, the President, than anyone asked for; \$7 billion more. It is more than the rest of the world is spending on defense. And what are we buying with it? We are buying all sorts of hardware, because those are the special interests with the most gravitas in this town, and that is wrong, at the time we are cutting student loans and cutting health research and cutting all sorts of things.

Now, one of the things that stands out of that whole list of add-ons that we are buying is the B-2 bomber. The B-2 bomber is the son of the B-1 bomber. I was here when Carter said no to the B-1 bomber, and then President Reagan moved in and turned that around and we built this whole fleet of B-1 bombers. Anyone seen them? Anyone seen them anywhere? No, no, no. Every time they take off, it seems they fall out of the sky. Actually, this last weekend we did see them. According to the paper, one B-1 bomber was used as a float on Fifth Avenue during the veterans parade. This has to be the most expensive parade float in the history of America.

Now we are going to add 20 more B-2's than anybody wanted into this budget, and make the American people pay for it. Will the American people feel more secure with their children in college, or having more B-2 bombers? Will the American people feel more secure with health care research funded, or more B-2 bombers? We could go on and on and on with those issues.

Are we really going to stand here and say we have to make tough decisions in every other area of the budget, and then add more to this budget, when we never did that even during the cold war? I never remember adding more to the defense budget than was asked for.

Please, one cannot be a fiscal conservative and vote for this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think that is somewhat of an exaggeration by the preceding speaker, that every time the aircraft take off, they fall out of the sky. I think that deserves a correction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the last 24 hours on this floor,

it is incredible. We are now advised the President has no intention of balancing the budget. But there is another aspect of that as well. He does not have a budget, he does not have a plan.

I compliment the committee for coming together with a solid approach to dealing with our defense needs; a plan that, despite the fact that defense has been cut 35 to 40 percent in the last 10 years, is stabilizing defense spending and in fact leveling it and decreasing it over the next 7 years.

But we are doing so in the context of a balanced budget. We are recognizing that, yes, there are limits. We cannot spend unlimited amounts of money on everything. We are going to set priorities and spend money where we need to spend it, on the most important issues that we have determined as a Congress.

I think an issue that also needs to be addressed here is that we are going to balance the budget, as remarkable as that may seem to the other side of the aisle.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly in a strong national defense. I think this country ought to have a defense that allows us to protect all of the interests of the United States of America. I just think that when we look at the reality of what the world is today, we need to recognize that our defense budget this year, this year, before we add an extra \$7 billion that the military really did not ask for into the defense budget, will outspend all of our NATO allies, all of the former Soviet States, all of the Eastern European countries, all of the former Soviet Union itself, all of China, all of both Koreas, all of Japan, and the entire Third World. If you put all of their defense budgets together, the United States will spend more.

I would think that maybe we could slide by on \$270 or \$280 billion a year. But, no, no, that is not good enough, because somehow the Republicans have come up with a notion that if they stand for a stronger national defense, no matter what the number the Democrats put up, as long as you put up a few billion dollars more, you can go out to the American public and say you are for a stronger national defense than the Democrats are for.

You pretend to try to balance the budget, when you know that if you look at the defense needs of this country, the military itself will tell you that the F-22 is not the airplane it needs. The B-2 bomber, we are going to spend money for an extra 20 B-2 bombers this year. Who are the B-2s going to go against? We are going to spend an extra \$3.5 billion for star wars.

I am all for theater based national defense systems. We wanted to protect our troops when they go into battle, that is fine with me. I think we ought to do it. We ought to put the research money into making certain we have a

good theater based defense system. But a space based star wars system? Nobody in their right mind, not even some of the most radical right-wing Republicans will tell you that star wars will work. It will cost trillions of dollars to defend ourselves against a threat that nobody believes is going to take place.

Why in God's name would anybody send a missile at the United States? They have to send a whole platoon of them in order to be effective. Why would they possibly do that? If they can put a bale of marijuana into a ship and bring it into New York harbor, why would they bother to put all these bombs on a missile? The truth of the matter is, that if we want to have a strong national defense, we ought to go out and build one. But we ought to build one in recognition of what the real threat to the United States is today.

What we are doing is we are spending billions and billions of dollars in national defense that we do not need to spend, and at the same time we are gutting and cutting and hurting the working class people of this country and the poor.

We are saying we do not have enough money for the Healthy Start Program, which deals with the fact we now have children in the United States of America that are dying at rates higher than in most Third World nations. We are willing to jack up the price of the Medicare premium, we are willing to go after the hot meals for senior citizens, we are willing to go after vulnerable people in this country and say we do not have enough money in the budget to help them. But we do have plenty of money in the budget to assist in building some of the most sophisticated weapons systems that this country does not need.

We ought to build a strong national defense, but we ought not to waste money on national defense that could in fact be making this country much stronger in the long run by investing in our most important resource, the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, I guess I need to make a couple points, particularly with some of the background that I have got with North Korea. I should advise the preceding speaker that if North Korea, for example, were to launch a nuclear weapon into Tokyo, or, as science progresses and they gain the ability, which they will gain within a very short period of time, to launch a nuclear weapon into the center of San Francisco, it will not take a "whole platoon" of missiles to be effective. The preceding speaker ought to be advised just one of those type of missiles anywhere could be very effective.

I would also like to advise the preceding speaker that when he talks about the working class, first of all, most people I know are in the working class. When I talk to them, they want

a strong defense. I agree with the preceding speaker that we need some balance, but I think that some of the remarks are somewhat exaggerated by the speaker, especially in regards to the missile.

I am very curious, hearing the strong comments about this budget, to see just exactly where the preceding speaker thinks the money is going to come from for the deployment by the Democratic President for troops in Bosnia, putting ground troops into Bosnia? I would be interested to see how his vote comes down on the deployment by our President to put those troops in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out if our true concern is a single missile going from Korea into Japan, maybe if the gentleman wants to build up a strong Japanese national defense, why do not you ask the Japanese to pay for it, instead of what your budget does, which is to allow us to subsidize it?

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

Mr. Speaker, the key here is we are being absolutely ignorant, and in fact we are being malfasant in office, if we refuse to acknowledge the fact that we have to prepare for defense against missiles. We lucked out, frankly, in Iraq and the Persian Gulf situation. We were able to stop some of those missiles. We need to improve that technology. It is going to happen again.

I might also add, the gentleman and I periodically see each other working out. I would add that the person working out who is in the best shape and who is the strongest person in the facility is the person who spends the most time on it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker mentioned the great investments that we have. We have a lot of great investments. The greatest investment that we make in our national defense are the young Americans, men and women, who wear the uniform, who train to defend this country or our national interests. And one reason that our defense costs are so high is we have an all-volunteer service. We do not have a draft or a conscripted army or military like the other nations that the gentleman is referring to.

In fact, of this \$240 billion bill, half of it, nearly half, \$120 billion-plus, goes to pay salaries, allowances, and medical care for those young Americans who are prepared at a moment's notice to be deployed wherever the President of the United States might choose to deploy them, and the salaries of the DOD civilian workforce.

So, yes, our costs are higher, because we do not have a draft. We have an all-

volunteer military, and we ought not to make those people live like paupers. There are too many of them today who are married and have families that have to rely on food stamps to get by, and that is not right.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I agree with you wholeheartedly. I offered an amendment to try to deal with the fact that we have got too many of our military not being paid enough money. If these funds were dealing with that issue, I would be more than happy to vote for it. I am talking about the \$7 billion additional funds that the military itself did not ask for that are put into this budget because of a lot of pork going back into Members' districts.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, when we get to the debate on the bill, we will be happy to address that very specifically. We ought to go ahead and get this rule passed so we can get to the real debate on what is right for the national defense.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just add that the previous speaker on my side of the aisle is absolutely correct. This debate right now is not the general debate on the military expenditures, and that is probably where the rest of this would be more appropriate. This debate is about the rule.

I would remind all of my colleagues in the House Chamber this rule was passed by voice vote in the Committee on Rules when we had a recorded vote on it. It is a conference report, but when the bill came up, it was passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. I think it is appropriate to move this on, get to a vote, and go into general debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate what the gentleman said about this rule. It should be a bipartisan rule. I hope it will pass quickly so that we can move on with the debate on the bill itself.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I also will support the bill. I serve on the Committee on National Security. I think this is a good bill. It gives us a strong defense. I hope Members will support the rule and the bill.

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

□ 1200

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the reason I am at the Democratic

podium is because I used to be over here, back when John F. Kennedy was a great President, and he stood up for America, and he supported a strong defense.

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here very patiently listening to this debate and getting ready for the other things we are going to be bringing up in the Committee on Rules, such as the balanced budget bill and other things. However, I just heard my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and others talking about how the Republican plan cuts all of these programs.

When I was debating the balanced budget earlier on as Chairman of the Committee on Rules, I insisted that all of the alternatives that were brought to the floor must bring about a balanced budget, and we told the Democrats that they would have to present one. We told ourselves, we told the President, and when we wrote a rule and brought these alternatives to the floor, all of them were balanced. What a change in concept over what had been happening over these last 40 years.

The Republican budget does balance the budget in 7 years, but as I look through it, I cannot find all of these cuts that everybody is talking about. When you talk about school lunch programs, when you talk about WIC, a very important program, when you talk about Head Start, all of them, I do not find cuts. I find increases in all of these programs. What I do find is that we have really cut the bureaucracy, we have really shrunk the power of the Federal Government and returned it to the States, and to the counties and the towns and the cities and villages and to the local school districts and to the private sector where it belongs.

In other words, getting rid of this huge Federal bureaucracy, that is where you will find the cuts in here, I say to my colleagues, the real cuts, not in programs for the needy.

Mr. Speaker, I heard somebody up here complaining because there was a B-2 bomber on display in a parade in New York City. Well, Mr. Speaker, I support that, because we need to promote pride and patriotism and volunteerism and the love of God. We need to really push those intangibles in this country. That is what Ronald Reagan did. That is what made him a great President.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of Ronald Reagan, I heard my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who does not talk like John Kennedy did, complaining because there is \$7 billion in this budget that the military did not ask for. Let me tell the gentleman why the military did not ask for it, because they were intimidated into not asking for it by the President of the United States, the President of the United States who, by his own admission, never had much use for our military. Of course, that, over

the years, has always turned my stomach.

Mr. Speaker, you go back to why this country was formed over 200 years ago, and it was formed as a republic of States. It is not a democracy, as such, not a federalist government, it is a republic of States that were joined together, and read the preamble to the Constitution, for the purpose of providing a common defense for these States. For my State and your State. That is really why we are here. Yet this Government has grown so much over the years where we have 37,000 employees in the Department of Commerce, in a Department of Commerce which is no longer an advocate for business and industry, but is there to regulate business and industry.

We have a Department of Energy with 17,000 employees, and has it produced a quart of oil or a gallon of gas? Not in my State, it has not. We have a Department of Education with 6,000 to 7,000 employees. Has that improved education? No, it has not.

The problem with the Republican budget is it does not go far enough. Here is mine that is a 5-year balanced budget, and let me tell you, it cuts those things, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, but it protected the defense budget of this country.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues what the budget bill does before you. Let me go back to 1979. Our military preparedness had reached such an all-time low that our military personnel, overseas, and even in this country, were on food stamps, and we were losing all of our qualified commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers. They could not afford to stay in our military.

Mr. Speaker, we changed all of that in 1981 with the election of Ronald Reagan, and we brought about a concept of peace through strength which rebuilt our military. No longer would we see what happened in 1979 when Jimmy Carter, in order to try to rescue some hostages out of Iran, had to cannibalize 14 helicopter gunships just to get 5 that would work and 3 of those failed, and so did the rescue attempt.

You turn that around and look what happened after we brought down the Iron Curtain and to what happened in the gulf war. Our military personnel went over there with the very best that we could give them. The night vision gear that our troops had that theirs did not allow us to see them. They could not see us, and the casualties were practically zero, because we gave them the very best.

Well, I say to my colleagues, do not think for a minute that the dangers are not out there. Somebody asked, why do we need a B-2 bomber? Well, if North Korea launches a missile into Japan, who is going to be there? We are the world leaders, we have to protect them.

If Iran or Iraq launches a missile into Israel, do you want Israel to pay for it?

Just think about this, I say to my colleagues. If you want to preserve this republic of States, we have to provide for a strong military. This budget does. This budget before you gives 9 and 10 and 11 percent increases in readiness, in manpower so that we can keep the young men and women, these great young men and women, so talented, in our military today. It provides for research and development.

I would say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] that I just admire the gentleman for what he has done there, for the procurements so that we can guarantee, should our troops have to go into Bosnia, 25,000 of them which will go there over my dead body, but should they have to go there, damn it, they better go there with the very best. That is what this bill does, and that is why I want everybody in this Chamber to come over here, and I want you to vote for this rule and vote for the bill, because you are going to be doing it for the young men and women that you will be voting some day to put in harm's way, and you've got to give them the best to do it.

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

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, speaking of women in the military, last week the new majority actually let the House of Representatives go a whole week without an overt attack on women's reproductive rights, but now they are back at it again. Today, the antichoice forces are hoping to score another victory by denying military women, women who happen to be stationed overseas, access to a safe and legal abortion in a military hospital, even when they will use their own money.

Military women defend our country with their lives. Now their lives will be in jeopardy when they are forced into Third World clinics and unsafe back alleys. Is that what you would want for your daughters? Is that what you would want for your granddaughters? Another day in Washington, another attack on Roe versus Wade. Stand up for military women, for their constitutional right to choose. Vote no on this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed by this testimony. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and ask the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] to stay on the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed a Treasury-Postal conference report on the appropriations bill, and the language that the gentlewoman objects to today was the identical language that was in that bill yesterday, which she voted for. I just think that consistency does have some value.

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

simply to say that I agree with the gentleman from Florida, that if one is going to vote one way and talk another way the next day, that is not very consistent.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, rather than not vote for a bill that was good in general, I was able to vote against my conscience for women. I did not like doing it; I did it. I do not want to do it again, and I hope the rest of the Congress will not either.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I am going to vote for the rule, because I believe that there has been a very favorable compromise on that. However, I am going to take this time to say that this bill is not the right bill for America, because this bill does not do what we think it does.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in readiness, military readiness, I believe in supporting the military personnel, but I do not believe in excess and waste. If this House voted last night for a 7-year balanced budget, it is important to tell the American people that this bill is \$8 billion more than the Defense Department needs and \$8 billion more than they requested.

If there is anything that I hear when I go home, the question becomes, why are we spending money for the defense of Germany and Japan and many other places? Not because we are not their allies and friends and would not rise with them in a time of real need—not peace time—but the reason why their budgets can be so low is because we are bolstering their defense, and it is certainly pursuant to our historical relationship during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, we are finished with World War II, and have since finished with the Korean war. So I ask my colleagues on this bill, it is important to be prepared, it is important to have the support of military personnel that are well trained. We saw that in Bosnia with the U.S. Captain who was shot down and his acknowledgement of the good training that the military gave him, and I will support that. But not \$8 billion extra in trinkets that are not needed.

So I think it is important that we defeat the bill, because we are not doing what we said we would like to do, and that is to balance the budget. We are taking it out of education, we are forcing 1 million of our children and making sure they cannot eat because of the proposed mean welfare reform package. We are taking money from Medicare

and Medicaid, and we are not dealing with a reasonable defense program.

Mr. Speaker, listen to the thorough work of the Defense Department. I think they make a lot of sense. They know how to get us ready for war, if necessary. They told us they did not need this extra \$8 billion. Let us get some common sense. Let us defeat this bill when it comes to the floor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentlewoman from Texas, because she has distinguished correctly the difference between this debate and the next debate. She did state that she was going to support the rule, and that is what this debate is about.

As we are nearing the vote, I would urge Members to remember that this is on the rule. We are going to have the general debate in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I think it is important that we pass this rule, and we pass it by a large margin. Let me say why.

Mr. Speaker, we just heard the previous speaker say that we should take the advice of the military on the spending issues. Under the Constitution, the most important role of this Congress is to provide for our national defense, to provide for our security. We do not need a Congress if we let these decisions be made by our Department of Defense.

Let me tell my colleagues why we are making these decisions. Just look at the experience we had with Iraq. If they were launching Scud-type missiles with intercontinental ballistic capability at the United States, there would be a whole different theme here today. If we took into consideration the situation with Iran that has bought dozens of submarines. If we took into consideration the dismantling of the former Soviet Union and the largesse arms sales of not just weapons, but weapons systems.

If we look at the policies of this administration who are now talking about selling intercontinental missile parts from the former Soviet Union, republics, on the world market, then we see that this Congress has a responsibility to make those decisions, and if we just remember the experience of the Gulf war when our friends would not even let us fly over their areas or their territories, we see the importance of a B-2 bomber, a B-2 bomber which is going to replace dozens of men and women who would be put at risk who are flying planes that are older than the pilots. We make those decisions. That is the purpose of this Congress, not to listen to people in the Department of Defense or people who want to spend money on other programs that do not provide for national security.

So this is our most important responsibility under the Constitution. That is why this rule is important, and that is why we must pass it by a large margin

and send a message to the White House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, there are differences of opinion on this side of the aisle. Some of our Members are for this conference report, others are not. I urge a yes vote on the rule, and I personally urge a yes vote on the conference report, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Again, the rule was passed by voice vote. We have just heard the comments from the gentleman, and of course, the ranking member on the Committee on Rules. I would urge my colleagues to vote for the rule. We can move right in, get past that, and get into a very healthy general debate.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 55, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 804]

YEAS—372

Abercrombie	Bryant (TX)	Deal
Ackerman	Bunn	DeLauro
Allard	Bunning	DeLay
Andrews	Burr	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Burton	Dickey
Armey	Buyer	Dicks
Bachus	Callahan	Dingell
Baesler	Calvert	Dixon
Baker (CA)	Camp	Doggett
Baker (LA)	Canady	Dooley
Baldacci	Cardin	Doolittle
Ballenger	Castle	Dornan
Barcia	Chabot	Doyle
Barr	Chambliss	Dreier
Barrett (NE)	Chapman	Duncan
Bartlett	Chenoweth	Dunn
Barton	Christensen	Edwards
Bass	Chrysler	Ehlers
Bateman	Clay	Ehrlich
Beilenson	Clayton	Emerson
Bentsen	Clement	Engel
Bereuter	Clinger	English
Berman	Clyburn	Ensign
Bevill	Coble	Eshoo
Bilbray	Coburn	Everett
Bilirakis	Coleman	Ewing
Bishop	Collins (GA)	Farr
Bliley	Collins (MI)	Fawell
Blute	Combest	Fields (TX)
Boehlert	Condit	Flake
Boehner	Cooley	Flanagan
Bonilla	Costello	Foglietta
Bonior	Cox	Foley
Bono	Coyne	Forbes
Borski	Cramer	Ford
Boucher	Crane	Fowler
Brewster	Crapo	Fox
Browder	Cremeans	Franks (CT)
Brown (CA)	Cubin	Franks (NJ)
Brown (FL)	Cunningham	Frelinghuysen
Brown (OH)	Danner	Frisa
Brownback	Davis	Frost
Bryant (TN)	de la Garza	Funderburk

Galleghy	Laughlin	Rohrabacher	Waters	Williams	Yates
Ganske	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt (NC)	Woolsey	
Gejdenson	Leach	Rose	Waxman	Wyden	
Gekas	Levin	Roth		NOT VOTING—5	
Gephardt	Lewis (CA)	Roukema			
Geren	Lewis (GA)	Royce	Fields (LA)	Pombo	Volkmer
Gibbons	Lewis (KY)	Sabo	Moran	Tucker	
Gilchrest	Lightfoot	Salmon			
Gillmor	Lincoln	Sanford		□ 1236	
Gilman	Linder	Sawyer			
Gonzalez	Lipinski	Saxton			
Goodlatte	Livingston	Scarborough			
Goodling	LoBiondo	Schaefer			
Gordon	Longley	Schiff			
Goss	Lucas	Schumer			
Graham	Maloney	Scott			
Green	Manton	Seastrand			
Greenwood	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner			
Gunderson	Martini	Serrano			
Gutknecht	Mascara	Shadegg			
Hall (OH)	Matsui	Shaw			
Hall (TX)	McCollum	Shays			
Hamilton	McCrery	Shuster			
Hancock	McDade	Sisisky			
Hansen	McHale	Skaggs			
Harman	McHugh	Skeen			
Hastert	McInnis	Skelton			
Hastings (FL)	McIntosh	Slaughter			
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Smith (MI)			
Hayes	McNulty	Smith (NJ)			
Hayworth	Metcalf	Smith (TX)			
Hefley	Meyers	Smith (WA)			
Hefner	Mica	Solomon			
Heineman	Miller (FL)	Souder			
Herger	Mink	Spence			
Hilleary	Moakley	Spratt			
Hilliard	Molinari	Stearns			
Hinchey	Mollohan	Stenholm			
Hobson	Montgomery	Stockman			
Hoekstra	Moorhead	Stokes			
Hoke	Morella	Stump			
Holden	Murtha	Stupak			
Horn	Myers	Talent			
Hostettler	Myrick	Tanner			
Houghton	Neal	Tate			
Hoyer	Nethercutt	Tauzin			
Hunter	Neumann	Taylor (MS)			
Hutchinson	Ney	Taylor (NC)			
Hyde	Norwood	Tejeda			
Inglis	Nussle	Thomas			
Istook	Ortiz	Thompson			
Jackson-Lee	Orton	Thornberry			
Jacobs	Oxley	Thornton			
Jefferson	Packard	Tiahrt			
Johnson (CT)	Pallone	Torkildsen			
Johnson (SD)	Parker	Torres			
Johnson, E. B.	Paxon	Torricelli			
Johnson, Sam	Payne (VA)	Trafficant			
Jones	Pelosi	Upton			
Kanjorski	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky			
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Vucanovich			
Kasich	Petri	Waldholtz			
Kelly	Pickett	Walker			
Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy	Walsh			
Kennedy (RI)	Porter	Wamp			
Kennelly	Portman	Ward			
Kildee	Poshard	Watts (OK)			
Kim	Pryce	Weldon (FL)			
King	Quillen	Weldon (PA)			
Kingston	Quinn	Weller			
Klecza	Radanovich	White			
Klink	Rahall	Whitfield			
Klug	Ramstad	Wicker			
Knollenberg	Reed	Wilson			
Kolbe	Regula	Wise			
LaFalce	Richardson	Wolf			
LaHood	Riggs	Wynn			
Lantos	Rivers	Young (AK)			
Largent	Roberts	Young (FL)			
Latham	Roemer	Zeliff			
LaTourette	Rogers	Zimmer			

NAYS—55

Barrett (WI)	Lofgren	Obey
Becerra	Lowey	Olver
Collins (IL)	Luther	Owens
Conyers	Markey	Pastor
DeFazio	Martinez	Payne (NJ)
Dellums	McCarthy	Rangel
Deutsch	McDermott	Roybal-Allard
Durbin	McKinney	Rush
Evans	Meehan	Sanders
Fattah	Meek	Schroeder
Fazio	Menendez	Stark
Filner	Mfume	Studds
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Thurman
Furse	Minge	Towns
Gutierrez	Nadler	Velazquez
Johnston	Oberstar	Vento

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1236

Mr. HILLIARD AND Mr. PALLONE 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further conference report on the bill H.R. 2126 and that I may include extraneous and tabular matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 271, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2126), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 271, the further conference report is considered as having been read.

(For further conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 15, 1995, at page H12415.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not opposed to the further conference report. If that is the case, then I would ask, under clause 2 of rule XXVIII, to control one-third of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania oppose the further conference report?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, no, I support the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for one-third of the time.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are presenting a good national defense appropriations bill today. I would say that it did not come easy. It is the work product of a lot of hours on the part of a lot of very serious and credible Members of this Congress in making this bill come together.

We had some 1,700 differences between our bill and the bill passed by the other body, and we were able to resolve all of those without too much difficulty, with one exception that I will mention in just a minute.

But I want to call attention to the members of the subcommittee who worked so diligently in making this possible today. I will mention the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSOTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], and the very distinguished ranking member and former chairman of this subcommittee, who has been a tremendous partner in a bipartisan effort all the way through, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], as the ranking member on the full committee who serves ex-officio on our subcommittee.

We had a lot of difficult decisions to make, and we did that, and to be as brief as I can, Mr. Speaker, this bill, this conference report, is very much similar to the conference report we presented about 7 weeks ago.

But there are two differences I would like to call to your attention. One is the Army is having difficulty meeting the end strength that was directed to them, and if we did not provide the additional money for the Army end strength issue, they would have had to release members of the Army without advanced notice and just put them on the street. So we provided the funding necessary to have the Army meet its end strength targets gradually. We did not add any new money to the bill. We just took the money out of one account and put it into the other account. So we took care of that problem for today.

The big issue and the one that caused us difficulty on the floor the last time this bill was before us was the language dealing with abortion. Now yesterday, when the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill was adopted, it included certain language dealing with abortion. After that passed the House, we went back to our conference and adopted the identical language, and so the language