

Gallegly	Laughlin	Rohrabacher
Ganske	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Gejdenson	Leach	Rose
Gekas	Levin	Roth
Gephardt	Lewis (CA)	Roukema
Geren	Lewis (GA)	Royce
Gibbons	Lewis (KY)	Sabo
Gilchrest	Lightfoot	Salmon
Gillmor	Lincoln	Sanford
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	Oliver
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

Waters	Williams	Yates
Watt (NC)	Woolsey	
Waxman	Wyden	

## NOT VOTING—5

Fields (LA)	Pombo	Volkmer
Moran	Tucker	

## □ 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 AP- PROPRIATIONS 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. LIVINGSTON], 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

dealing with abortion in this conference report today is the same as it was.

That language, Mr. Speaker, in this conference report today, is identical to that which we passed yesterday on a vote of 374 to 52, and so we believe that the major controversies have been resolved now and we can move expeditiously to deal with this bill.

I might say just briefly, Mr. Speaker, that this has been a bipartisan effort. This legislation provides funding for the defense of our Nation and our national interests. Almost half the money in this bill goes to pay the salaries and the allowances, housing, medical care, et cetera, for those who serve

in our military in uniform who are trained and prepared to defend this Nation's interests wherever they might be.

Today, while the world looks at Bosnia and is wondering what is going to happen, the President of the United States has suggested that he intends to send some 20,000 Americans to Bosnia. Those young people need to be taken care of properly, and nearly half of the money in this bill goes to pay their salaries, their housing allowances, medical care, and things of this nature. This has always been a bipartisan effort to provide for national defense.

□ 1245

It is a little unfortunate that this effort has been allowed to become embroiled in the larger issues of the budget reconciliation, the budget bills, the continuing resolutions. It does not really belong there, because defense properly should be strictly nonpolitical, it should be bipartisan in nature.

The bill we present today is just that. It is nonpolitical, it is bipartisan, and it addresses the needs, as we see it, that our national defense establishment needs to be prepared for whatever contingency there might be.

At this point I would like to submit for the RECORD tables summarizing the conference agreement.

## H.R. 2126 - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE I</b>						
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>						
Military Personnel, Army .....	20,870,470,000	19,721,408,000	19,884,808,000	19,778,587,000	19,948,187,000	-924,283,000
Military Personnel, Navy .....	17,752,237,000	16,930,806,000	17,008,383,000	16,978,206,000	17,008,563,000	-743,874,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps .....	5,800,071,000	5,877,740,000	5,828,340,000	5,888,540,000	5,885,740,000	+85,899,000
Military Personnel, Air Force .....	17,388,578,000	17,108,120,000	17,284,820,000	17,188,443,000	17,207,743,000	-180,836,000
Reserve Personnel, Army .....	2,188,120,000	2,101,386,000	2,122,888,000	2,102,486,000	2,122,486,000	-45,854,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy .....	1,411,408,000	1,348,223,000	1,350,823,000	1,348,323,000	1,358,523,000	-55,886,000
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps .....	350,048,000	381,751,000	388,101,000	384,551,000	378,151,000	+28,103,000
Reserve Personnel, Air Force .....	771,834,000	782,781,000	783,588,000	783,881,000	784,588,000	+12,852,000
National Guard Personnel, Army .....	3,350,506,000	3,218,258,000	3,240,858,000	3,222,422,000	3,242,422,000	-108,083,000
National Guard Personnel, Air Force .....	1,238,429,000	1,246,427,000	1,254,827,000	1,259,827,000	1,259,827,000	+21,188,000
<b>Total, title I, Military Personnel .....</b>	<b>71,101,502,000</b>	<b>68,868,863,000</b>	<b>69,231,882,000</b>	<b>68,881,029,000</b>	<b>69,191,008,000</b>	<b>-1,910,484,000</b>
<b>TITLE II</b>						
<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>						
Operation and Maintenance, Army .....	18,443,688,000	18,134,736,000	18,898,131,000	17,947,228,000	18,321,985,000	-121,723,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile & DBOF) .....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Navy .....	21,478,170,000	21,175,710,000	20,848,710,000	21,185,301,000	21,278,425,000	-188,745,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile & DBOF) .....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps .....	2,021,715,000	2,289,722,000	2,508,822,000	2,341,737,000	2,382,522,000	+370,807,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force .....	19,813,827,000	18,208,587,000	18,873,793,000	18,202,437,000	18,561,287,000	-1,052,880,000
(By transfer - Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 1995/1997) .....	(23,500,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-23,500,000)
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile & DBOF) .....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide .....	10,477,504,000	10,366,782,000	9,808,810,000	9,804,088,000	10,388,585,000	-88,809,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve .....	1,237,008,000	1,088,591,000	1,119,191,000	1,088,312,000	1,119,191,000	-117,818,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve .....	846,819,000	828,042,000	841,585,000	828,042,000	858,542,000	+12,923,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve .....	81,882,000	80,283,000	102,078,000	80,283,000	100,283,000	+18,421,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve .....	1,471,808,000	1,488,847,000	1,518,887,000	1,488,847,000	1,518,287,000	+47,782,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard .....	2,424,888,000	2,304,108,000	2,384,487,000	2,381,708,000	2,440,808,000	+15,920,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard .....	2,772,928,000	2,712,221,000	2,737,221,000	2,724,021,000	2,778,121,000	+3,183,000
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army .....	2,544,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,544,000
Court of Military Appeals, Defense .....	6,126,000	6,521,000	6,521,000	6,521,000	6,521,000	+395,000
Environmental Restoration, Defense .....	1,480,200,000	1,622,200,000	1,422,200,000	1,487,000,000	1,422,200,000	-58,000,000
Summer Olympics .....	14,400,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	+600,000
Special Olympics .....	3,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,000,000
Humanitarian Assistance .....	65,000,000	79,790,000	.....	60,000,000	.....	-65,000,000
Former Soviet Union threat reduction .....	380,000,000	371,000,000	200,000,000	325,000,000	300,000,000	-80,000,000
Contributions for International Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Activities Fund .....	.....	65,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid .....	.....	.....	50,000,000	.....	50,000,000	+50,000,000
<b>Total, title II, Operation and maintenance .....</b>	<b>82,819,085,000</b>	<b>80,800,280,000</b>	<b>81,483,817,000</b>	<b>79,940,808,000</b>	<b>81,582,727,000</b>	<b>-1,288,358,000</b>
(By transfer) .....	(173,500,000)	(180,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(-23,500,000)
<b>TITLE III</b>						
<b>PROCUREMENT</b>						
Aircraft Procurement, Army .....	1,028,753,000	1,223,067,000	1,468,067,000	1,468,823,000	1,558,805,000	+530,052,000
Missile Procurement, Army .....	813,795,000	878,430,000	842,830,000	846,555,000	885,555,000	+51,760,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army .....	1,151,814,000	1,298,988,000	1,818,884,000	1,388,284,000	1,852,745,000	+500,831,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army .....	1,125,321,000	795,015,000	1,018,315,000	1,080,881,000	1,110,885,000	-14,838,000
Other Procurement, Army .....	2,649,348,000	2,256,601,000	2,570,125,000	2,780,002,000	2,789,443,000	+120,085,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy .....	4,827,845,000	3,898,488,000	4,310,703,000	4,887,383,000	4,588,384,000	-38,281,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy .....	2,158,080,000	1,787,121,000	1,738,211,000	1,771,421,000	1,888,827,000	-489,253,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps .....	417,779,000	.....	483,778,000	.....	430,053,000	+12,274,000
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy .....	5,412,484,000	5,081,935,000	5,577,958,000	7,082,001,000	8,843,958,000	+1,231,484,000
(By transfer) .....	(1,200,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,200,000,000)
Other Procurement, Navy .....	3,388,171,000	2,388,080,000	2,480,870,000	2,384,280,000	2,483,581,000	-845,580,000
Procurement, Marine Corps .....	422,410,000	474,116,000	480,882,000	587,138,000	458,847,000	+38,537,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force .....	6,382,482,000	6,183,888,000	7,140,703,000	7,183,258,000	7,387,983,000	+1,015,521,000
(Transfer to O & M, Air Force) .....	(-23,500,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+23,500,000)
Missile Procurement, Air Force .....	3,580,782,000	3,847,711,000	3,223,285,000	3,550,182,000	2,843,831,000	-816,831,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force .....	288,401,000	.....	321,328,000	.....	338,800,000	+50,368,000
Other Procurement, Air Force .....	6,888,101,000	6,804,888,000	6,808,425,000	6,540,951,000	6,284,230,000	-874,871,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide .....	2,088,230,000	2,178,917,000	2,187,085,000	2,114,824,000	2,124,378,000	+88,148,000
National Guard and Reserve Equipment .....	770,000,000	.....	808,125,000	777,000,000	777,000,000	+7,000,000
<b>Total, title III, Procurement .....</b>	<b>43,124,836,000</b>	<b>38,882,048,000</b>	<b>42,876,405,000</b>	<b>44,480,774,000</b>	<b>44,088,318,000</b>	<b>+944,880,000</b>
(By transfer) .....	(1,178,500,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-1,178,500,000)
<b>TITLE IV</b>						
<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION</b>						
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army .....	5,478,413,000	4,444,175,000	4,742,180,000	4,838,131,000	4,870,884,000	-807,728,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy .....	8,727,388,000	8,204,530,000	8,715,481,000	8,282,051,000	8,748,132,000	+20,784,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force .....	12,011,372,000	12,598,438,000	13,110,338,000	13,087,388,000	13,128,587,000	+1,115,188,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide .....	8,882,942,000	8,802,881,000	9,028,888,000	8,188,784,000	8,411,057,000	+746,115,000

## H.R. 2126 - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense .....	238,003,000	259,341,000	259,341,000	246,082,000	251,082,000	+ 13,079,000
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense .....	12,501,000	22,587,000	22,587,000	22,587,000	22,587,000	+ 10,086,000
Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation...	35,130,569,000	34,331,853,000	35,878,590,000	35,474,024,000	36,430,109,000	+ 1,299,510,000
TITLE V						
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS						
Defense business operations fund .....	945,238,000	878,700,000	1,573,800,000	1,178,700,000	878,700,000	-86,538,000
National Defense Sealift Fund .....	724,400,000	974,220,000	974,220,000	1,024,220,000	1,024,220,000	+ 299,820,000
(Transfer out, prior year funds - SCN) .....	(-1,200,000,000)					(+ 1,200,000,000)
Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds .....	1,869,638,000	1,852,920,000	2,548,020,000	2,202,920,000	1,902,920,000	+ 233,282,000
TITLE VI						
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS						
Defense health program:						
Operation and maintenance .....	9,814,370,000	9,885,525,000	9,917,125,000	9,908,525,000	9,838,325,000	+ 323,955,000
Procurement .....	329,589,000	288,033,000	288,033,000	288,033,000	288,033,000	-41,556,000
Total, Defense Health Program .....	9,943,959,000	10,153,558,000	10,205,158,000	10,198,558,000	10,226,358,000	+ 282,399,000
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Defense: 1/						
Operation and maintenance .....	365,784,000	363,860,000	363,860,000	363,860,000	363,860,000	-1,924,000
Procurement .....	198,985,000	299,448,000	299,448,000	224,448,000	285,000,000	+ 86,035,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation .....	20,700,000	53,400,000	53,400,000	53,400,000	53,400,000	+ 32,700,000
Total, Chemical Agents .....	575,449,000	746,698,000	746,698,000	631,698,000	672,250,000	+ 96,801,000
Drug Interdiction Defense .....	721,286,000	680,432,000	688,432,000	688,432,000	688,432,000	-32,854,000
Office of the Inspector General .....	140,872,000	139,228,000	178,228,000	139,228,000	178,228,000	+ 37,356,000
Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs .....	11,381,548,000	11,719,914,000	11,818,514,000	11,847,814,000	11,785,288,000	+ 383,720,000
TITLE VII						
RELATED AGENCIES						
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System						
Fund .....	198,000,000	213,900,000	213,900,000	213,900,000	213,900,000	+ 15,900,000
Community Management Account .....	92,884,000	93,283,000	75,883,000	98,283,000	90,683,000	-2,001,000
National Security Education Trust Fund .....	8,500,000	15,000,000		7,500,000	7,500,000	-1,000,000
Total funding available .....	(-75,000,000)		(-78,100,000)			(+ 75,000,000)
Rescission .....			-12,279,000			
Kaho'olawe Island conveyance and Environmental Restoration						
Trust Fund .....	50,000,000			25,000,000	25,000,000	-25,000,000
Total, title VII, Related agencies .....	349,184,000	322,183,000	277,304,000	344,683,000	337,083,000	-12,101,000
TITLE VIII						
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Additional transfer authority (Sec. 8005) .....	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,400,000,000)	(2,400,000,000)	(+ 400,000,000)
FFRDCs labs (Sec. 8046) .....	-520,589,000		-90,097,000	-90,000,000	-90,000,000	+ 430,589,000
Overseas Military Fac. Invest. Recovery .....	7,088,000					-7,088,000
Guard and Reserve "Overbilling" .....	67,000,000					-87,000,000
National Science Center, Army (Sec. 8074) .....	45,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	+ 40,000
Sports account, reappropriation .....	800,000					-800,000
Civil-Mil coop program .....	8,000,000					-8,000,000
Rongelap Resettlement Trust Fund .....	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Coast Guard .....	39,487,000		44,000,000			-39,487,000
Mil retirement fund (COLA acct) .....	376,000,000					-376,000,000
Defense conversion SMOCTA reapprop .....	10,000,000					-10,000,000
Phil Naval Shipyard Utility Reconfig Proj .....	14,200,000					-14,200,000
Contr to International Organizations .....	-4,561,000					+ 4,561,000
Payments to the Asia Foundation .....	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Procurement (rescission) .....	-304,900,000					+ 304,900,000
Aircraft procurement, Navy (resc) .....	-200,000,000					+ 200,000,000
Burdensharing contribution, misc. receipts .....	-380,000,000					+ 380,000,000
Contractor ADP (Sec. 8101) .....			-30,000,000		-30,000,000	-30,000,000
Transfer of funds (Sec. 8118) .....			(200,000,000)			
Military Technicians .....				98,060,000		
Rescissions (Sec. 8083) .....				-232,244,000	-561,217,000	-561,217,000
Inflation Reestimate (Sec. 8125) .....					-632,000,000	-632,000,000
Management efficiencies (Sec. 8128) .....					-442,000,000	-442,000,000
VCX lease termination costs (Sec. 8126) .....						
Total, title VIII .....	-857,422,000	85,000	-78,012,000	-228,109,000	-1,855,132,000	-1,087,710,000

## H.R. 2126 - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE IX</b>						
<b>MANAGEMENT FUNDS</b>						
Emergency Response Fund, FY94 supplemental .....	299,300,000					-299,300,000
<b>Grand total</b> .....	<b>245,018,068,000</b>	<b>236,386,017,000</b>	<b>244,039,500,000</b>	<b>242,725,841,000</b>	<b>243,293,297,000</b>	<b>-1,724,771,000</b>
<b>BUDGET SCOREKEEPING ADJUSTMENTS</b>						
Fiscal year 1995 adjustments:						
Disposal & lease of DOD real property (Sec. 8055) .....	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	
Adjustment for unappropri'd balance transfer (Stockpile) .....	150,000,000					-150,000,000
Stockpile collections (unappropriated) .....	-150,000,000					+150,000,000
Emergency Response Fund, FY94 supplemental .....	-299,300,000					+299,300,000
Rescission of unobligated balances:						
Procurement 1993/1994 .....	-517,000,000					+517,000,000
RDT&E, 1994 .....	-131,800,000					+131,800,000
Sec. 115 of P.L. 104-6:						
Missile procurement, Air Force .....	(-76,900,000)					(+76,900,000)
RDT&E, Air Force .....	(76,900,000)					(-76,900,000)
Emergency funding, FY95 supplemental .....	-2,475,097,000					+2,475,097,000
Burdensharing contribution, misc. receipts .....		-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	-50,000,000
Travel and administrative reduction (H.R. 1944) .....	-50,000,000					+50,000,000
<b>Total adjustments</b> .....	<b>-3,464,997,000</b>	<b>-42,000,000</b>	<b>-42,000,000</b>	<b>-42,000,000</b>	<b>-42,000,000</b>	<b>+3,422,997,000</b>
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>						
Title I - Military Personnel .....	71,101,502,000	68,898,883,000	69,231,892,000	68,881,029,000	69,191,006,000	-1,910,494,000
Title II - Operation and Maintenance .....	152,916,085,000	150,630,280,000	150,450,000,000	150,940,690,000	151,550,727,000	-1,369,355,000
Title III - Procurement .....	43,124,836,000	38,862,049,000	42,878,405,000	44,460,774,000	44,069,316,000	+944,880,000
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation .....	35,130,598,000	34,331,953,000	35,879,580,000	35,474,024,000	36,430,109,000	+1,299,510,000
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds .....	1,699,836,000	1,852,920,000	2,548,020,000	2,202,920,000	1,902,920,000	+233,282,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs .....	11,381,546,000	11,719,914,000	11,816,514,000	11,847,914,000	11,785,298,000	+383,720,000
Title VII - Related agencies .....	349,184,000	322,183,000	277,304,000	344,883,000	337,083,000	-12,101,000
Title VIII - General provisions .....	-857,422,000	85,000	-78,012,000	-226,109,000	-1,955,132,000	-1,097,710,000
(Additional transfer authority) .....	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,400,000,000)	(2,400,000,000)	(+400,000,000)
Title IX - Management Funds .....	299,300,000					-299,300,000
<b>Total, Department of Defense</b> .....	<b>245,018,068,000</b>	<b>236,386,017,000</b>	<b>244,039,500,000</b>	<b>242,725,841,000</b>	<b>243,293,297,000</b>	<b>-1,724,771,000</b>
Scorekeeping adjustments .....	-3,464,997,000	-42,000,000	-42,000,000	-42,000,000	-42,000,000	+3,422,997,000
<b>Grand total</b> .....	<b>241,553,071,000</b>	<b>236,344,017,000</b>	<b>243,997,500,000</b>	<b>242,683,841,000</b>	<b>243,251,297,000</b>	<b>+1,668,226,000</b>
Allocation recap (sec. 602b):						
Mandatory .....	196,000,000	213,900,000	213,900,000	213,900,000	213,900,000	+15,900,000
Discretionary:						
Non-defense .....	381,439,000					-381,439,000
Defense .....	240,973,832,000	236,130,117,000	243,783,600,000	242,469,941,000	243,037,397,000	+2,063,785,000
<b>Total discretionary</b> .....	<b>241,355,071,000</b>	<b>236,130,117,000</b>	<b>243,783,600,000</b>	<b>242,469,941,000</b>	<b>243,037,397,000</b>	<b>+1,682,326,000</b>
<b>Grand total</b> .....	<b>241,553,071,000</b>	<b>236,344,017,000</b>	<b>243,997,500,000</b>	<b>242,683,841,000</b>	<b>243,251,297,000</b>	<b>+1,668,226,000</b>

1/ Included in budget under Procurement title.

2/ FY 1995 Enacted includes Supplemental P.L. 104-6 (+\$2,709,997,000 in new BA and -\$2,259,956,000 in Rescissions).

3/ FY 1995 Enacted includes Rescissions P.L. 104-19 of -\$50,000,000 in BA and -\$37,500,000 in outlays for Travel reductions.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in debate on the rule about an hour ago, last night this House voted to promise to the American people that we would have a balanced budget within 7 years. Yet today this bill is coming before us \$7 billion above the budget request of the Pentagon and the President. We are being required this year to reduce domestic discretionary spending by \$24 billion. This bill is \$1.7 billion above last year.

Because of the size of this bill and because this is a zero sum game on the appropriations side of the budget, what that means is that the reductions in domestic programs—for things like education, job training, housing, research—those reductions are 50 percent larger than they would have to be if we did not have this budget \$7 billion above the President and \$1.7 billion above last year.

Now, as I said earlier, the money in this bill above the President's budget did not go into readiness, it did not go into operation and maintenance. It went into procurement, and it went into pork: the double P's.

This chart, as I mentioned before, demonstrates what has happened to the Russian military budget since the Berlin Wall came down. The red bars demonstrate that the Russian military budget has declined by 70 percent since 1989. The U.S. military budget has declined by 10 percent.

Do I think we ought to cut our budget to the level of Russia? No. Do I think that this demonstrates that we have a little margin of safety? You betcha.

Now, people will say, "Well, we have to worry about more than Russia." So, again, as I said during the rule, this chart demonstrates how our military spending stacks up against all of the military spending for our potential military adversaries. Russia, China, Syria, Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and good old muscle-bound Cuba. We spend 2.5 times as much as they do. That does not count the spending by our NATO allies, and I think it is safe to say they are on our side.

So I make that point to demonstrate that there is no military emergency that requires this expenditure of money under these tough financial situations. I do not think we should be buying twice as many B-2 bombers as the Pentagon wants. I do not think we should be buying the F-22 years early at a cost of \$70 billion. I especially do not think we ought to be loosening up on loopholes which allow executive compensation at military contractors corporate headquarters to be paid for by the taxpayer, rather than out of corporate profits.

I have a GAO report which indicates what has happened to executive compensation at corporations that provide military hardware to the United

States. We, until this year, limited the amount of that compensation that would be paid for by taxpayers to \$250,000 per executive. That is equal to the compensation for the President of the United States, for God's sake. Anything above that amount, the company was supposed to pay for out of its profits.

This year, this House adopted an amendment lowering that amount to \$200,000. But in conference, they adopted a loophole which provides an exception if the Office of Federal Procurement Policy establishes in the Federal acquisition regulation's guidance governing the allowability of individual compensation, and those words were added to the conference report, which in effect opens the door to charging taxpayers a whole lot more than \$200,000 per executive.

Now, if you take a look what those contractors are paid, you see that a number of these contractors are paid more than \$1 million, some \$1.6 million, one of them \$2.7 million. I would ask, why should those executive salaries be financed to such a gross level by the taxpayers of the United States? We have one corporation, for instance, where the top executive in 1989 was paid \$634,000. Today their top paid executive is paid \$1.6 million. Another corporation, which laid off 20,000 workers earlier this year, in 1989 they were paying their top executive \$764,000. Today they are paying him \$2.1 million. Hardly the kind of action you would expect to see in a corporation that is having huge layoffs of average workers.

I do not think the taxpayer wants Uncle Sam to be financing these huge increases in corporate executive salaries for defense contractors when their workers are being laid off. This bill contains a loophole that allows that to happen.

My motion to recommit will simply say that we are going to reimpose the hard limit that this House first proposed; namely, \$200,000. Anything above that, if the company wants to pay it, they pay it out of their own corporate profits, not out of taxpayers' pockets.

So that is what I will have in the motion to recommit. I would urge that Members vote for the motion to recommit and against this bill, because given the so-called promise that was made last night to balance the budget in 7 years, we simply cannot afford the spending in this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, one of the things we do every year in the hearings is to try to adjust the bill, depending on what we consider is the threat, and we work hard at that. I do not think we can depend on our allies to come to our aid in any circumstances. I think we learned after World War I and World War II that if we are not prepared for what we consider the immediate and long-term threat, we could have a problem.

We have cut the defense budget substantially over the years. As a matter

of fact, most of the cuts made to the Reagan and Bush budget were made in defense. We cut \$155 billion out of defense over that 12-year period. I think that the Iraq war, the war in Saudi Arabia, shows we did cut it in a very sensible way. We cut it in a way that we still had good troops, quality people, and good technology.

Now, lately, we have allowed procurement to start to slip. The reason we had a low number of casualties was the fact that we had superior technology, superior training, and superior troops. And that was a tribute, I think, to the House, and the House can be proud of what happened.

This year, we are starting to get behind again in a number of areas. Real property maintenance, there is a \$12 billion backlog. In depot maintenance, there is a \$2 billion backlog. All those things are important to readiness. Now, we try periodically to overcome those, but we take the amount of money allocated to us by the budget resolution, and we do the best we can.

The area where we saw slipping dramatically was procurement. We have reduced procurement from \$120 billion over a 6- or 7-year period to about \$40 billion. Now, \$40 billion is a lot of money, and we feel it is well spent, because if we do not keep our industrial base, if we do not have the most modern technology, our people are at risk. Even in an operation like Bosnia, which is not an all-out war, but an area where you need technology to protect our troops, we want to make sure we have the finest equipment available to our troops and there is a minimal risk to them.

I remember in Iran when we sent a helicopter to Iran, we had to borrow spare parts; we had a disaster where a number of Americans were killed because the training was inadequate. As a matter of fact, at that period of time, half the combat aircraft in our arsenal were dead-lined because of lack of spare parts. We do not want that to happen again.

I assess the type of deployments that we have been making is what will continue. Our troops have been denied for long periods of time away from home, the same troops over and over again. Our AWACS airplanes, we have 10,000 people in the Adriatic supporting this long-term commitment we have for humanitarian airlift to Bosnia.

As a matter of fact, it is the longest airlift in the history of the United States. Without that, people would have been starving. We have a commitment there. We have upheld our commitment. But the airplanes are wearing out. As a matter of fact, the 141's, we are flying the wings off of them. We have to reengine a number of KC-135's. As the C-17's come into the arsenal, we need to continue to upgrade the 135's and the 141's.

So we have a problem with procurement. We have a problem with modernization, and we have tried to balance that out.

We also set aside, and this was a suggestion of the chairman, we set aside money for the operations as they go on, for continual flights, the operations in the Adriatic, the continual flights into Bosnia. That is the kind of thing we should be doing so the American people and the Congress know what is going on.

So our military is ready. It is stretched thin, but I think that the amount of money we have appropriated here is just about the right amount. One thing for sure, if the Defense Department does not agree, they will come back and ask for rescissions, and we will adjust that as the year goes on, as they always do.

So I think we have a good bill, and I hope Members will vote for the bill.

One of the issues that came up in the passage of the bill was an issue that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] brought up. The gentleman got up and brought to our attention the fact that there were a number of people at the highest level being reimbursed because of the build-down and consolidation of these defense companies.

The gentleman was absolutely right. The gentleman believed that we should do something about it. The gentleman believed that in the conference, and we accepted that language, and in the conference we have tried to address that language.

The Defense Department at first did not agree with us. They felt that it was appropriate what they had done. We pointed out to them, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman, and I pointed out that we felt this was not only bad public policy, but it is something we felt needed to be changed.

We have been negotiating with those folks. We think that we have done the best we could do in order to comply with what the gentleman from Vermont wanted. I would be glad to answer any questions that the gentleman may have about that issue. We appreciate the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

□ 1300

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and I thank very much the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] for their cooperation on this issue.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly described the situation. It seemed to me, and I think virtually every Member of the U.S. Congress, that there was something wrong in the process when the taxpayers of America were asked to supply \$31 million in executive bonuses to the highest ranking officials, who are very, very well paid, of Lockheed and Martin Marietta when they merged.

When I brought that issue to the floor, the gentleman from Florida [Mr.

YOUNG] was very gracious, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] was very gracious, and they accepted the amendment. Since then, we together fashioned perfecting language to make absolutely clear that the Pentagon ought not to spend \$1 of appropriated funds for the Lockheed-Martin payments or any such future payments pursuant to the merger of defense contractors.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania described the fact that during the conference, as I understand it, the Pentagon was a little bit vague about their willingness to accept this provision. What I would like to do right now is enter into a colloquy with both Mr. YOUNG and Mr. MURTHA, just to make it absolutely clear on the RECORD that our intent is to make certain that not one penny of taxpayer money goes to the merger of Lockheed-Martin and to the bonuses that those chief executives are going to receive.

Would the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] want to comment on that?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Vermont to let me comment first.

The conferees included a general provision, section 8122, which is intended to ensure that no taxpayer funds be used to pay for special executive bonuses triggered by corporate mergers. The conferees directed the Department to promptly revise its policies and regulations to make it absolutely clear no taxpayers' funds shall be used to reimburse any contractor for special executive bonuses or any other special retention incentive, payments for executives triggered by the corporate merger acquisition, or any other change in corporate control.

Now, this was agreed to by all the conferees. Since then, I guess even before then, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and I had written to the Secretary of Defense and pointed out that we are very serious about this language and we expect it to be carried out, and they have said to us in private conversations they intend to carry out our direction.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, then, it is his understanding that from the highest levels of the Pentagon there is an assurance that not one penny of taxpayers' money will go to the merger of Lockheed-Martin? That is your understanding? No golden parachutes for those guys?

Mr. MURTHA. That is exactly right.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their support on this issue.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] who himself is an ace fighter pilot.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]

states that Russia has no Stinger anymore. Last year they dropped five Typhoons—

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman's time afterwards.

Mr. OBEY. I did not say that. Quote me accurately.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Russia dropped five typhoon nuclear submarines last year. I do believe the gentleman says we do not need to fund the F-22 now, instead of later.

Russia has built, developed, and is flying currently the SU-35. The SU-35 is superior to our F-14 and F-15's today. It cruises at about 1.4 Mach. The F-22 cruises at 1.4 mach. The F-22 carries advanced AMRAAM missile. The SU-35 carries the AA-10, which is much superior to our AMRAAM missile. And when Russia is still developing arms and engaged in global warfare, then, yes, we do have a threat.

If we go to Bosnia for 1 year, estimates are between \$3 billion and \$6 billion to the United States. The bottom-up review is review that was set forth after the scale-down of our military, the bare bone minimum to be able to fight two conflicts. The GAO has put us at \$200 billion below the bottom-up review—\$200 billion. And my colleagues on the other side wonder why we are trying to increase defense a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have given blood and been shot, and a person does not much care what the machine costs if it gives them an advantage over our enemy, if it will bring them home alive instead of in a body bag.

I think what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] have done is appropriate to protect our men and women in the armed services. And, by the way, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], it is in the Constitution to do that.

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

I would simply point out, the gentleman can talk about all the new Russian fighters he wants. My question is how many of them: 1, 2, 5, 10? We have 700 F-15's and we are going to buy another 400 F-22's. He has to be kidding. Come on.

The other thing I would say is, if the gentleman thinks that the Russian military power is such a powerhouse these days, I have a one-word reply for him, Chechnya. They could not even handle that one.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me time.

I believe it is essential to send this bill back to conference to save at least

several billion dollars. In the first place, we should be very clear. My friend from Pennsylvania said we cannot count on our allies coming to our aid. No one has even suggested that. What this says is that America should go to everybody else's aid.

There is a fundamental confusion we have today. We are not now talking about our survival against enemies like the Nazis and the Soviet Union that threatened our very ability to maintain free societies. We are talking about places where it might be useful to intervene, where it would advance things.

Members have said if we intervene we want our troops to be as well armed as possible. Of course, we do. That is not in dispute. The question is will we continue to maintain this position where we are on call for everybody in the world.

I was struck by Tuesday's New York Times, an article about the great success of the Asian newer economies. And it says one reason they have been able to be so successful is America's role in the cold war of defending them gave them a stable structure. It talks about how low their government expenditures were. Sure, because ours were high.

This continues to be the most expensive form of foreign aid in the history of this country, because it subsidizes the military budgets of all of these wealthy nations that then compete with us, that build up trade surpluses; and we say to them do not worry we will take charge. Our disparity in military spending, with all of our allies and competitors, is overwhelming.

Mr. Speaker, it is not simply some erring without cost. This is the greatest of the reverse Houdinis. Houdini used to have other people tie him in knots and his trick was to get out of the knots. That was what Houdini did. Other people tied him up and he got out of the knots.

The politicians' version is the reverse Houdini. They tie themselves up in knots and then say to people gee, we would love to help you, but we are all tied up in knots. We do not really want to cut your Medicare, but we cannot really afford it. We do not really want to make it more expensive for you to go to school and raise what your kid has to pay, but we have not got the money. We wish we could do more about cleaning up the Superfund sites, we wish we did not have to have retroactive liability, but we cannot afford it. This is why we cannot afford it, because of the massive subsidies of France, and Japan, and Germany, and England, and Thailand, and Malaysia, and all those other wealthy and increasingly wealthy nations.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not have to put anybody in jeopardy. In fact, Members have said what about Bosnia. A majority of Members are apparently prepared to vote not to send the troops to Bosnia. Why then are they insisting on providing the funds to do it? The more we fund this operation, the more

money we give them to take care of Bosnia, the less our chance is going to be to block the troops going there.

If, in fact, we do believe there is an over-extension, and I think that is right, and in fact we do believe that it is time the Europeans not came to our aid, I do not want them to come to defend the Mexican border, I do not think we need any troops from them to come here, we need them to do something on their own behalf. Let us stop subsidizing them at the expense of Medicare, education and the environment.

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

I want to make sure that all the Members understand. What I am talking about is our own defense. And to develop a fighter and to deploy it to the field takes 16 years. And I sympathize with what the gentleman from California said, since he is the top ace of the Vietnam war, and certainly knows as much about fighter aircraft as anybody in the House. The relationship between having exactly what the pilot needs versus something that is inferior—

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman it takes almost 5 years just to develop the engine for an airplane. That is the problem with the F-18, the F, right now.

And I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], right now in Bosnia-Herzegovina we are flying our F-18's and our Strike Eagles. The wing life of those airplanes are almost all gone. Those F-18's, they want the CD because they want the top model. That is almost gone.

The Air Force has not bought an airplane in 2 years because they cannot afford it. The F-16 that Captain O'Grady flew. We did not replace that. And to protect our kids in combat and make sure our people on the ground are well protected, we need those, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to make one other point. There is not money in this bill for any troops to be deployed in Bosnia. This is for the ongoing operations that are going on right now.

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

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a responsible effort to fund a strong defense. I supported it 7 weeks ago when we first debated it, and I support it now.

Let me make three quick points:

This is not a less dangerous world. Many of us traveled to Jerusalem just last week to pay honor to the visionary peacemaker who was martyred for his cause. Religious fanaticism is increasing all around the world and it takes many forms. We need to be prepared.

Second, the abortion rider has no place in this bill. It caused the House to defeat the conference report when it first came up. It serves to penalize military servicewomen and their dependents and makes it difficult for them to exercise their constitutional rights.

Third, the plus-up in spending is, in my view, appropriate and I'm prepared to defend it in the context of a 7-year balanced budget, which I voted for. Among the items funded are critical procurement including the C-17, the F-18C/D and E/F, defense satellites, and long lead for more B-2 strategic bombers.

Let me comment on the B-2.

We can afford to buy more B-2's and we should. Within the budget resolution profile, money is available as we:

First, retire the expensive, aging B-52 fleet;

Second, buy the cheaper munitions the B-2 uses; and

Third, reap savings from acquisition reform.

Much of the argument against more B-2's assumes the B-52 will remain combat capable through the year 2030. The last B-52H was produced in the early 1960's, so the aircraft will be almost 70 years old in 2030.

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

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

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

The new Deputy Defense Secretary testified this May 18 before the Senate Armed Services Committee that, "If I do not have any carriers available for 15 days and I do not have any tactical aircraft in theater and I do not have any means to get tactical aircraft in theater and we have to continue with this MRC scenario, then I am going to need a lot more bombers than I have in the current force." That means B-2's.

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

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



Mr. Speaker, as a parent of two draft-age children and two younger ones, I am convinced that we must field and fully fund the most effective and survivable weapons systems. The most precious resource this country has is our children. Today, in this House, let us fund the best defense for our children and the men and women who will defend them. Vote for this conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, during most of the debate today, we have actually spent more time talking about subjects and matters that are extraneous to national defense items that really have nothing to do with national defense. A lot of those extraneous matters, although they are extremely important, should be done in other legislative bills or appropriations bills, or they could be done by the States, or they could actually be done maybe in some cases by the cities and the counties.

Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that this Congress and this President have a responsibility to do that no State can do, that no city or county can do, that is to provide for the defense of this Nation and for our national interests wherever they might be. We are talking about preparing kids in uniform who have volunteered to serve in the military, preparing them to accomplish whatever mission they might be assigned to, and do it effectively, and at the same time give themselves some protection while they are doing it.

So only the Federal Government can do this. The other extraneous materials should not even be a discussion or part of the discussion on the defense appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] keeps bringing that same chart up about how much the Americans spend versus how much somebody else spends. I am going to repeat something again a little bit differently than I did the first time.

Some years ago, a lot of our messages were delivered in music and in songs and in poetry. There was a song where the key phrase went, "and the soldiers get paid \$21 a day, once a month." How many are old enough to remember that? Twenty-one dollars a day once a month.

Well, since that time, we have begun to pay our soldiers considerably more, no enough, but a whole lot more than \$21 a day once a month. However, the other nations to whom the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] compares us in our spending, they are still paying \$21 a day once a month, because they are conscripts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], a member of the subcommittee.

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

I am happy to rise in support of this conference report and the important funding provisions that it does contain. I hope that my colleagues and the President will sign this bill, because it will increase our Nation's current and future readiness. It will improve the quality of life of our members of our Armed Forces, and most importantly, it will ensure our long-term security.

The main thing this conference report does is ensure our readiness of our America's Armed Forces. The bill provides for future readiness by reversing a decade of steep decline in weapons procurement. The prior speakers are correct. It takes years and years to get these weapons systems and these procurement systems in place. I hope that we do not have to go to war again, but if we do, we have to give our men and women, our young people in the armed services the best possible equipment possible, and Stealth equipment and technology is the answer for our future.

Captain O'Grady is from my district, and if he had been in a Stealth aircraft, perhaps he would not have been shot down over Bosnia. So that is the importance here. B-2, the F-22, FA-18 aircraft, they are our future and we need to fund them.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], another distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, just a point I would like to make to start out in support of this bill, if the entire Congress worked as cohesively as the members of this subcommittee have worked on this issue, we would be all at home picking out our turkeys at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It provides adequate, by no means more than necessary, funding for important factions of our military: Pay raises, tank-killers, helicopters, F-22s, and yes, the B-2 bomber. Those of us who have the vision that this bill is not just about this year or next year, it is about the next century and how we are going to protect our country from outside aggressors, some of which may not even have been born yet, but we have to have that vision to preserve our freedom and liberty.

People in this country can walk down the streets safely knowing that foreign aggressors are no threat, and we enjoy the freedom to speak out, freedom of speech, freedom to demonstrate, freedom to express ourselves as conservatives, as liberals, as moderates in this country from all across the Nation. We have enjoyed these freedoms forever, because we are always ready, and we demonstrate to the world through the support of our military that we are

going to be ready for anything that might transpire.

For those idealists who sit out there and say, well, there is no threat out there now, lose sight of the vision that this bill is important for the next century as well.

We have to maintain a strong military, because without a strong military, we do not even have an opportunity to talk about preserving programs like HUD or Commerce or any of these other things that people might think are important. If we do not protect ourselves in the future, we are not going to be able to consider any of this stuff. Education will not even be a possibility for us if we are not willing to all stand up and preserve the greatest military that this planet has even seen to make sure that our children are protected well into the next century.

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

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

Let me just answer the prior speaker. Yes, indeed, we should be talking about threat. To me, the threat is the threat of the debt. The threat of the debt is what people have been talking about here, and this is the one budget that is coming in over \$7 billion over what the Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for. We did not even do that during the cold war. So you cannot talk threat of the debt and then turn around with this.

Mr. Speaker, then we also have to say, are the things that we are buying into here threat-based? Are we dealing with what the real threat is?

The real threat today is things like rental cars blowing up, the world center blowing up, the Oklahoma place, radical fundamentalism. How do you use B-2 bombers against that? Then let us look at this post-cold-war world. If you took everything that we owe the United Nations for peacekeeping, for dues, for everything, that would break out to \$7 per American. Well, we are not going to pay it, because we think it needs to be reformed, and we could debate how is the best way to get it reformed.

Mr. Speaker, if you take this budget and divide it up per American, this is \$1,000 per American, \$1,000. Now, is this really dealing with the threat? There is big increases in here for the CIA, but it, of course, does not need reform? I do not think so. There is the B-2 bomber which no one can figure out why we are buying it. We have not even figured out when we are going to use the B-1 bomber or many of the other things.

I think basically what we do by paying and spending all of this money is we are saying to the whole world, let us do it all. We want to continue to be the Atlas and hold up the defense everywhere. If we do this, then I think we cannot complain about the world saying to us, OK, you do everything in Bosnia. You raised your hand. You volunteered to do it. You put all of the

money in. We will be voting today to spend more than the rest of the world.

Think of the message that sends. We are volunteering to do it all.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. The subcommittee has done a superb job, and I appreciate them bringing it back, and hopefully in a much more acceptable version than the one that unfortunately was sent back several days ago.

Under the Constitution, this Congress is charged with raising and maintaining the military. I have over the past several years worked to put together a budget that would meet the needs of our military in future years. It is difficult. This year I was successful in putting one together.

I testified before the Committee on the Budget, and I concluded that we needed, over the next 5 years, an additional \$44 billion over the administration recommendation. That figure, given by the Committee on the Budget, was at or near what I recommended.

This bill takes care of the soldiers and the sailors and the airmen and the marines; it gives them adequate pay, it helps take care of their families and their needs, and you have to keep those young people in the military. It takes a long time to grow a good staff sergeant, a long time to grow a major, a long time to grow a chief petty officer, a long time to grow a letter commander.

Then we look at what we are asking them to work with. A very aging bomber fleet, other airplanes that no longer are produced, trucks, equipment that is mundane, but yet is old and is wearing out. We need to keep our forces the strongest in this world. This bill helps to do that.

We noticed in the paper just the other day where the Pentagon says there are going to be some \$60 billion short on just procurement over the next several years. We must proceed along this line and fully fund the military and take care of our troops.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that it has been said, primarily on this side of the aisle, that this defense appropriations bill is above the level of what the President requested. I would hope that they would bear in mind that while it may be above the level that the President requested, it is not above the level of the things that the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have come to us and told us were

needed, even though it is beyond what the Commander in Chief ultimately signed up to.

Mr. Speaker, I would also suggest that we on this side of the aisle had a Contract With America, and one of the provisions was to rejuvenate our national defense. This is our opportunity to fulfill that very, very significant part of that contract. This bill is below the budget level; it is a bill that, verifying what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, it seeks to do something about the deterioration and the maintenance of our real property and the depot maintenance accounts, which are woefully deficient, and to prevent a degrading of our readiness. This is a bill whose time certainly must today come. Let us get on with it.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I once said on the House floor years ago, it has been used several times, why are we spending all of this money on defense, on these B-2's? We cannot see it; they cannot be detected by radar. Why do we not just put out a press release and tell the Soviets we have 500. How would they know anyway?

Well, I have come around full circle, like many of my colleagues have. We know it is not like that really, and after Captain Scott O'Grady, and after Alrich Ames, it does not quite work that way, does it? I voted for military cuts, and quite frankly, we cut an awful lot. I think we have cut too far.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, I support this measure. Let me say this to the Congress of the United States, the most urgent duty and responsibility placed on this Congress is our national defense. Folks, we just cannot get it done with the Neighborhood Crime Watch. It is going to cost money, but freedom, freedom is costly.

Now, there are some people who think that there is just some left-wing liberals around here who just want to go on with all of these social programs. Let me say this to the membership of the Democratic Party. We have, and we have always stood, for a strong national defense. When the lives of the American people in the free world are at stake, we then do stand up, and I say today, let us stand up for a couple of chairmen here, past and present, who have done their job. It is not a popular job, but freedom sometimes is very costly. Today is one of those days.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here in support, and I would like the authorizing committee to look at my bill that would allow the placement of some of these troops falling out of chairs without armrests overseas, placing them on our border, not to make arrests, but to help us to secure our borders as well.

I support this bill, I am proud to support this bill, and I have come full cir-

cle on some of these issues, but damn it, if one is wrong on something and one sees something that can be improved, I think it is incumbent upon us to do the right thing, and I am proud to support the bill.

□ 1330

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and want to compliment, I will call you both chairmen, I respect both of you a lot, if I can do that here on the House floor.

I think that it is a fool's folly to think that he is full of wisdom when he is safe and secure in peace to reduce his strength. In reality, when one is alone in the world, without strength and might, there is a true loss of courage.

This bill addresses the shortfalls in our military readiness and addresses the quality of life issues which we all seek and desire for the men and women in arms. I support this bill.

At a time of what happened on this House floor this morning, when there can be a total breakdown and lack of civility among this body, we can come together in a bipartisan fashion when it comes to the issue of national security. We are going to do that today and we are going to send this bill down to the President, and I believe it is a bill which he should sign, not veto.

God bless this country.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I want to commend Chairman YOUNG and Vice Chairman MURTHA.

It is a good bill, in an impossible situation. I did not support every weapons system in this bill, but this is the best bill that we could come up with and one that I strongly support.

I want to thank the committee for supporting military personnel, especially our health care system. I can personally attest to its excellence.

I want to thank the committee for its emphasis on missile defense. Contrary to what we have heard on this floor, the threat has not gone away. When Russia goes all the way to the top, when the Norwegians launch a missile, a satellite missile, and activate their entire missile defense system to the point of almost launching an attack against this country, there is something we have to be on the alert for. When the Russians are offering to sell their SS-25 technology to Third World nations, we have to be prepared. When the North Koreans and the Chinese are building missiles that can hit our mainland, we have got to be able to increase missile defense funding, and this bill does that.

I want to thank the committee, also, and I want to say to my colleagues who say we have not cut defense, would you please tell the 1 million members of the UAW, the machinists union, the electrical workers union, that we have not cut their jobs? Would you be the one to tell them? For those who want to support sending our troops to Bosnia, tell us where we are going to get the \$1.5 billion that you do not want to support in this bill.

This is a good bill. Let us vote "yes."

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

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

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time, and for his consideration in the last week.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2126 as reported by the conference committee. Over the past 2 weeks, I was prepared to offer a motion to instruct the conferees on this bill to insist upon the House-passed language restricting the use of funds for a troop deployment in Bosnia without congressional approval.

I did not press that motion because I have been assured that we will vote on the Hefley bill, H.R. 2606, before the Thanksgiving recess. H.R. 2606 will send a clear message to the President that it is unacceptable to fund the deployment of United States troops in Bosnia without congressional approval.

The bill before us, the defense appropriations bill, will end the dangerous downsizing of our military over the past 10 years. I urge my colleagues to support it. I thank the gentleman from Florida for a job well done.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all I do want to congratulate the committee for following through on the request that we have had to prevent golden parachutes at defense contractor corporations from being paid for by the taxpayer. I think that is long overdue. I congratulate the committee.

I simply want to say again in closing, we voted last night for a balanced budget in 7 years. It is fundamentally inconsistent with that vote for the Congress, the next day, to pass legislation which adds \$7 billion to the President's budget for military spending, and adds money above the amount spent last year.

This chart demonstrates that Russia has reduced its spending by over 70 percent. I would point out to the gentleman from Florida that this chart takes into account wage differentials. We have only reduced our military budget by about 10 percent. That hardly indicates to me that we are in a military jam.

The United States will spend \$1.3 trillion over the next 5 years. The defense budget in adjusted dollars is higher than it was under Eisenhower, higher

than it was in 1975 under Nixon, and even through the cold war. We spend as much as the rest of the world combined; 4 times as much as Russia, almost 17 times as much as the 6 bad guys: Iraq, North Korea, Iran, Libya, Syria, and Cuba. The United States, NATO, and our Asian allies account for 80 percent of all military spending in the world.

I think, with all due respect, that is more than enough. I urge Members to vote "no" on passage, and I urge Members to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit. That motion to recommit will simply eliminate a loophole in the conference report to assure that corporation profit rather than taxpayers' money will be used to pay for executive compensation for military contractors above \$200,000. I do not think the taxpayers should be financing multimillion-dollar salaries for these executives while those companies are downsizing their own workers, and while we are downsizing our own budget.

I would simply urge Members to remember that, despite the fact that many people in this House would like to ignore it, this bill is fundamentally related to what happens on Social Security, what happens on Medicare, what happens on education, what happens on housing, what happens on all of the other priorities that we have in our budget.

We simply cannot restore any significant amount of the huge reductions in education, in housing, in environmental protection unless this bill is brought under financial control. Right now it is not. I urge Members to vote "no." I urge members to vote "yes" on the recommit motion.

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

I just want to make a couple of comments. I want to compliment the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] for holding off on his motion on Bosnia because I think we are in a very delicate stage in the negotiations and I think any action by the House at an inappropriate time could endanger the talks that are going on, and I would even appeal in the House that it is delicate and we certainly would not want to send the wrong signal and be responsible for what happens if it turned out the wrong way.

The other thing, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit and say that we worked out the best we could work out with the Senate on the language, on the pension at the recommendations of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] and the support of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. I would hope that Members would vote against recommitment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], former chairman of this subcommittee, for an excellent job.

I represent a district in the State of Washington where we have a number of defense bases, McCord Air Force Base, Fort Lewis, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Trident Submarine Base, Keyport. Not all of those are exactly in my district but they are on the border of my district, and some inside.

I hope we get this defense bill passed, because thousands of workers, even though we get this essential versus nonessential, but thousands of these workers at these bases have been sent home. The sooner we can pass the defense appropriations bill, get it through the Senate, send it to the President, get it signed, we can get those people back to work.

I agree with those who say today that we now must put a floor under the decline in defense spending. We have been cutting defense every year since 1985. We have cut the budget by about \$10 billion per year. In other words, in 1985 we were at \$350 billion, today we are at about \$250 billion. With that, we have reduced procurement from about \$135 billion in 1985 down to \$41 to \$43 billion this year. This committee puts the money back into procurement. I think that is the next major problem, and the Joint Chiefs have pointed it out.

Today is a day when I think this committee and the House should come together and pass this bill. I think the chairman of the committee and the good staff have done an excellent job.

A number of people have mentioned stealth technology. I will just tell Members this: In the Gulf war, the F-117 proved that stealth technology works. I think it is the best investment we can make to save lives and save money.

I urge my colleagues to stay with the committee, let us pass this bill, and let us get it down to the President and get it signed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on National Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, we come to the concluding moments of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I must preface my remarks by saying the ostensible beauty of this institution is that we can indeed challenge each other intellectually and politically, and that we can differ over the definition of what is a strong national defense.

Having said that, let me try to place this legislation, from my perspective, in proper context.

The cold war is over. Mr. Speaker, ushering in a new era, the post-cold-war world. Uncharted water, unprecedented activity, tremendous challenges, perhaps, as the gentleman from California said, danger as well as opportunity.

In the context of the cold war, it was easy for us to understand who we thought our enemies were.

I would assert that the enemy of the post-cold-war world is war itself, and the tremendous challenge and opportunity we have is to give our children who we have been talking about over the past 72 hours and our children's children perhaps the greatest gift that we can give them, a world at peace.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out eloquently what the spending issues are here.

□ 1345

At this very moment, our spending level, American military budget, is roughly equal to the combined military budget of the rest of the world. That is awesome. When you combine America's military expenditures with the expenditures of our allies, that is, our friends, that exceeds 80 percent of the world's military budget. So less than 20 percent of the so-called enemies, less than 20 percent of the world's military budget spent by them. We outspend our ostensible enemies 4 to 1, absolutely astonishing.

Let us place this bill in that context. What does this bill do in a post-cold-war world where war is now the enemy, where peace is now the challenge, where we have tremendous domestic issues before us? This military budget increases our military expenditures above and beyond requests in excess of \$7 billion.

Let us look within that budget to ascertain what they cut. At a time when we have the opportunity to dismantle the dangerous nuclear weapons that have been aimed at us for 40 years in the context of the cold war from the Soviet Union, we cut Nunn-Lugar funds designed to take away the nuclear weapons to, indeed, give a fantastic and awesome gift to our children, and that is a world without the insanity and the madness and the danger of nuclear weaponry. We cut that program.

In the context of the post-cold-war world where every 2 years we are closing military bases and downsizing and communities are experiencing economic dislocation, where the domestic challenges are how do we engage the economic conversion so that those communities can rebound and move into the 21st century, we cut, in this program, technology conversion. It flies in the face of reality, it certainly challenges this gentleman's logic.

What do we increase? We increase programs like the B-2 bomber and other programs. People have spoken eloquently to them. I do not have time

to go through those programs and challenge them, but I do want to take the time so to say this: Many of these extraordinary weapons systems, Mr. Speaker, if the truth be told, and I choose to tell it today, have little, if anything, to do with enhancing the nature of our national security. It has to do with the fundamental issue of generating employment in people's communities. And that is real. That for me is not a throw-away line. If someone is building a B-2 bomber, they may agree with my intellectual and political analysis and say, "Ron, I don't think we need a Cold War weapons system that is flying around trying to find a post-cold-war mission. But if you stop my job on Friday, where do I work on Monday?" That is our challenge. But not to keep building B-2's for employment, but developing fiscal, monetary, and budgetary policies designed to generate employment.

I would conclude by saying this: This military budget, in the context of the post-cold-war world, is going in the wrong direction. It should be rejected. Let us come together to march in the 21st century with sanity and reason.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate all of those who participated in the debate. It has been a good debate.

I disagree with some of the arguments that I heard from one side or the other, and I know in the heat of debate sometimes we sometimes misspeak unintentionally.

The gentleman who just spoke said that we had cut the effort to denuclearize the former Soviet Union. Not so. The nuclear arms reduction program, chemical weapons destruction, those programs were fully funded.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. In the context of the rules debate laid out a list of what you reduced, and you said you reduced Nunn-Lugar in technology conversion. We can go get the record on that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I say to my friend we did not reduce this part of Nunn-Lugar; the part dealing with nuclear destruction and chemical destruction, we did not reduce that part of that program.

First, let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, regarding the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] to recommit, there will be no debate. I would at this point ask, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] has already done, that we handily defeat that motion to recommit and get on with getting this bill passed.

The last few days I have heard a lot of criticism that we cannot get appropriations bills passed. That is what we are trying to do today. We are trying to get a good bipartisan appropriations bill passed to provide for the defense of our Nation.

There are some things in here that are not definitely related to national

defense specifically that have been complained about, but let me tell you about an example of one. One thing the Defense Department does not want in this bill is breast cancer research. But we have a lot of women in the military, and we have a lot of men in the military who have wives and daughters, and we provide an adequate sum to accelerate the breast cancer research and treatment program essential to every woman in America because no woman is exempt from breast cancer. We try to do our share.

Other appropriations bills in the last decade have increased every year, increased, except for one. The legislation providing for funding for our national defense has gone down every year for the last 10 years, and, my friends, this year this bill is less than it was last year by \$400 million. So this is the 11th year in a row that we have reduced spending on national defense.

But in this bill we are getting a lot more for the defense dollars than we have gotten in a long time. I might say this, that at the same time that we are reducing our spending for national defense, we have a commander in chief who is deploying U.S. troops around the globe anytime that he wants to and, for the most part, without coming to Congress and getting the approval of the Congress.

In fact, at the beginning of this year we had to appropriate over \$2 billion to pay for those contingencies that had not been planned for.

One of the big arguments has been we did things in here the Pentagon did not ask for. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] had a chart I have seen so many times. I have a scroll here the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] says he memorized. This scroll reaches across the wall. It talks about minor items nobody ever identified, because they are not politically attractive, but minor items that could keep the war effort or defense effort from moving if called upon to do so. So we take care of a lot of those things.

But this one, I just brought this one along to show you. Our President believes we are not doing enough for national defense. You remember this picture. President Clinton said last December he wants more in military spending over the next 6 years. He said even in an era when the public wants a leaner Government, the people of this country expect us to do right by our men and women in uniform. This is exactly what we are doing in this bill: Taking care of the men and women in uniform.

The question has been raised so many times the Pentagon does not want many of the things in this bill. Well, on Veterans Day, believe it or not, November 11, this headline appeared, and this story in the Washington Post, "Pentagon Leaders Urge Accelerated 50 Percent Boost in Procurement." Now, these are not contractors. These are not industry people. These are not defense politicians. These are the guys

that fought the war in Desert Storm. These are the people that fought the war in Vietnam, and the actions in Panama and Grenada and places like that.

What do they say? The uniformed leaders of the Armed Forces, worried about aging weapons and equipment, after a decade of declining procurement, have recommended a roughly 50-percent jump in spending on purchases over the next 2 years. The people that have to fight the wars, the ones that we count on to defend this Nation, preserve our security and our freedom and our independence, they say that the 10-year decline in providing for the national defense has got to change.

That is what your war-fighting Pentagon says we ought to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "no" vote on the motion to recommit and a strong "yes" vote on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the further conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the further conference reports?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the Conference Report on the bill H.R. 2126 to the Committee on Conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to: insist on the inclusion of the provision committed to conference in section 8075 of the House bill as follows: "None of the funds provided in this Act may be obligated for payment on new contracts on which allowable costs charged to the government include payments for individual compensation at a rate in excess of \$200,000 per year."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 121, nays 307, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 805]

YEAS—121

Ackerman	Ford	Obey
Baldacci	Frank (MA)	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Furse	Owens
Becerra	Gephardt	Pallone
Beilenson	Green	Pastor
Bentsen	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Bevill	Hilliard	Pelosi
Bonior	Hinchey	Poshard
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Boucher	Jacobs	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Roth
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roukema
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Clyburn	Kildee	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Kleccka	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Serrano
Conyers	Lantos	Shays
Cooley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Costello	Lincoln	Stark
Coyne	Lipinski	Stokes
Danner	Lofgren	Studds
de la Garza	Lowe	Thurman
DeFazio	Luther	Torres
Dellums	Maloney	Towns
Deutsch	Markey	Velazquez
Dingell	Martinez	Vento
Dixon	Mascara	Visclosky
Doggett	Matsui	Volkmer
Duncan	McCarthy	Waters
Durbin	McDermott	Watt (NC)
Engel	Meehan	Waxman
Eshoo	Mfume	Wise
Evans	Miller (CA)	Woolsey
Farr	Minge	Wyden
Fattah	Moakley	Wynn
Filner	Nadler	Yates
Flake	Neal	
Foglietta	Oberstar	

NAYS—307

Abercrombie	Collins (GA)	Gilman
Allard	Combest	Gonzalez
Andrews	Condit	Goodlatte
Archer	Cox	Goodling
Armey	Cramer	Gordon
Bachus	Crane	Goss
Baesler	Crapo	Graham
Baker (CA)	Cremins	Greenwood
Baker (LA)	Cubin	Gunderson
Ballenger	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Barcia	Davis	Hall (OH)
Barr	Deal	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	DeLauro	Hamilton
Bartlett	DeLay	Hancock
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Bass	Dickey	Harman
Bateman	Dicks	Hastert
Bereuter	Dooley	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Bilbray	Dornan	Hayes
Bilirakis	Doyle	Hayworth
Bishop	Dreier	Hefley
Bliley	Dunn	Hefner
Blute	Edwards	Heineman
Boehrlert	Ehlers	Henger
Boehner	Ehrlich	Hilleary
Bonilla	Emerson	Hobson
Bono	English	Hoekstra
Brewster	Ensign	Hoke
Browder	Everett	Holden
Brownback	Ewing	Horn
Bryant (TN)	Fawell	Hostettler
Bunn	Fazio	Houghton
Bunning	Fields (TX)	Hoyer
Burr	Flanagan	Hunter
Burton	Foley	Hutchinson
Buyer	Forbes	Hyde
Callahan	Fowler	Inglis
Calvert	Fox	Istook
Camp	Franks (CT)	Jefferson
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Johnson (CT)
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, E. B.
Castle	Frisa	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Frost	Jones
Chambliss	Funderburk	Kasich
Chenoweth	Galleghy	Kelly
Christensen	Ganske	Kennelly
Chrysler	Gejdenson	Kim
Clement	Gekas	King
Clinger	Geren	Kingston
Coble	Gibbons	Klink
Coburn	Gilchrest	Klug
Coleman	Gillmor	Knollenberg

Kolbe	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
LaHood	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Largent	Orton	Smith (WA)
Latham	Oxley	Solomon
LaTourette	Packard	Souder
Laughlin	Parker	Spence
Lazio	Paxon	Spratt
Leach	Payne (VA)	Stearns
Levin	Peterson (FL)	Stenholm
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Stockman
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Stump
Lightfoot	Pickett	Stupak
Linder	Pombo	Talent
Livingston	Pomeroy	Tanner
LoBiondo	Porter	Tate
Longley	Portman	Tauzin
Lucas	Pryce	Taylor (MS)
Manton	Quillen	Taylor (NC)
Manzullo	Quinn	Tejeda
Martini	Radanovich	Thomas
McCollum	Ramstad	Thompson
McCrery	Reed	Thornberry
McDade	Regula	Thornton
McHale	Richardson	Tiahrt
McHugh	Riggs	Torkildsen
McInnis	Roberts	Torricelli
McIntosh	Roemer	Trafficant
McKeon	Rogers	Upton
McKinney	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
McNulty	Ros-Lehtinen	Waldholtz
Meek	Royce	Walker
Menendez	Salmon	Walsh
Metcalf	Sanford	Wamp
Meyers	Sawyer	Ward
Mica	Saxton	Watts (OK)
Miller (FL)	Scarborough	Weldon (FL)
Mink	Schaefer	Weldon (PA)
Molinari	Schiff	Weller
Mollohan	Schumer	White
Montgomery	Scott	Whitfield
Moorhead	Seastrand	Wicker
Moran	Sensenbrenner	Williams
Morella	Shadeegg	Wilson
Murtha	Shaw	Wolf
Myers	Shuster	Young (AK)
Myrick	Sisisky	Young (FL)
Nethercutt	Skaggs	Zeliff
Neumann	Skeen	Zimmer
Ney	Skelton	
Norwood	Smith (MI)	

NOT VOTING—4

Chapman	Rose
Fields (LA)	Tucker

□ 1414

Messrs. FLANAGAN, KLINK, EDWARDS, LIGHTFOOT, CARDIN, SCHUMER, LEWIS of Kentucky, GORDON, FAZIO of California, TEJEDA, and REED changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. DANNER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. COOLEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 806, on the way to the Chamber, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 158, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 806]

YEAS—270

Abercrombie	Baesler	Barrett (NE)
Allard	Baker (CA)	Bartlett
Andrews	Baker (LA)	Barton
Baldacci	Bass	
Armey	Ballenger	Bateman
Bachus	Barr	Bevill

Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Castle  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling

Goss  
Graham  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Ingليس  
Istook  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHale  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meek  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Mink  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Murtha  
Myers  
Myrick  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney

Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Peterson (FL)  
Pickett  
Pombo  
Porter  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Salmon  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skeltton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Traficant  
Visclosky  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—158

Ackerman  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Blute  
Bonior  
Borski  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Camp  
Cardin  
Chabot  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Coble  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit

Conyers  
Cooley  
Costello  
Coyne  
Danner  
DeFazio  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Durbin

Ehlers  
Engel  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Fattah  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Furse  
Ganske  
Gilman  
Gordon  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Heinemann  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kildee  
Klecza  
Klug  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln

Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Markey  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McInnis  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Moakley  
Morella  
Nadler  
Neumann  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel

Riggs  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shays  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Stark  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Torricelli  
Townsend  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—4

Fields (LA)  
Hayes

McHugh  
Tucker

## □ 1423

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 264

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House Resolution 264.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

(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. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution—on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON]—which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is currently considering several ethics complaints against Speaker Newt Gingrich;

Whereas the Committee has traditionally handled such cases by appointing an independent, non-partisan, outside counsel—a procedure which has been adopted in every major ethics case since the Committee was established;

Whereas—although complaints against Speaker Gingrich has been under consideration for more than 14 months—the Committee has failed to appoint an outside counsel;

Whereas the Committee has also deviated from other long-standing precedents and rules of procedure; including its failure to adopt a Resolution of Preliminary Inquiry before calling third-party witnesses and receiving sworn testimony;

Whereas these procedural irregularities—and the unusual delay in the appointment of an independent, outside counsel—have led to widespread concern that the Committee is making special exceptions for the Speaker of the House;

Whereas the integrity of the House depends on the confidence of the American people in the fairness and impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Therefore be it resolved that;

The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should report to the House, no later than November 28, 1995, concerning:

(1) the status of the Committee's investigation of the complaints against Speaker Gingrich;

(2) the Committee's disposition with regard to the appointment of a non-partisan outside counsel and the scope of the counsel's investigation;

(3) a timetable for Committee action on the complaints.

Mr. Speaker, this is motherhood. This is not to take a prejudicial view of their findings, it is asking for a clear, specific report to this House, of which we stand ready to receive at any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designed by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days of its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce the Chair's designation at a later time.

The Chair's determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege will be made at the time designed by the Chair for consideration of the resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
GIFT REFORM ACT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 268 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

## H. RES. 268

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 250) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for gift reform. The amendments recommended by the Committee on Rules now printed in the resolution are hereby adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as