

H.R. 7—A REAL STINKEROO

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Franklin once said, "Fish and visitors smell after three days." He might also have added the National Security Revitalization Act which comes to the House today.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder the Republican leadership does not want this bill lying around too long, and do not want it debated and are ramming it through, because it is a real stinkeroo. Assembled by pollsters, this bill is malodorous in many respects, and I say to my colleagues, "It really takes your breath away when it calls for spending billions of dollars on star wars."

I understand that the Republican Caucus gave Dr. Edward Teller, the father of star wars, a standing ovation when he recently addressed the group, a standing ovation for star wars in this bill at the expense of readiness for American troops, a standing O for star wars which jeopardizes START, ABM, and other treaties, including chemical weapons treaties.

Let us get serious, Mr. Speaker, and reject the ghost of star wars past. Support the Edwards amendment, and reject H.R. 7. It is ill-conceived, ill-constructed, and probably unconstitutional.

I say to my colleagues, "Let's get serious about our national defense."

H.R. 7—ATTACK ON OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 7.

This bill zeros out money to improve the technology on proven weapon systems that help save our soldiers' lives and instead wastes it on star wars.

This bill kills the Technology Reinvestment Project and knocks the legs out from under companies which have already started significant technology development projects.

For example, Silicon Video Corp. in California is working on flat panel display technology so in times of war we will not be reliant on other countries for this critical technology.

Now H.R. 7 abandons funding for this key technology which is essential to every one of our weapons systems, and instead reallocates the money to star wars.

The defense application of flat panel displays is not debatable. The cuts in H.R. 7 dangerously reduce our armed services' technological edge over potential enemies, all in the name of star wars.

We need budget priorities based on national security needs, not political manifestos; for our soldiers' safety, not politicians' reelection campaigns.

I urge members to oppose H.R. 7.

It is wrong-minded, and it attacks our national security.

□ 1140

NATIONAL SECURITY LEGISLATION PROMISES EMOTION BUT BIPARTISAN SUPPORT EXPECTED

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am going to roll up my pant legs because it is too late to save my shoes. As we prepare to debate H.R. 7 today, one thing we are going to do throughout this debate is we are going to call Members on the facts. There is going to be a lot of emotion here, and some say when you do not have the facts on your side, you can resort to emotional arguments like throwing out huge numbers, like throwing out neat-sounding terms.

But, Mr. Speaker, in today's debate and in tomorrow's debate, we are going to call Members on the facts as they are. If we have a clean and open debate on what H.R. 7 is all about, as we did in the committee, we will find that this is not a Republican issue; we will find, as we did in the committee, that 11 Democrats joined with every Republican for the largest bipartisan vote out of committee of any of the contract items. The final vote was 41 to 13.

So as we listen to the rhetoric today, Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members, keep your eyes on your shoes because it is going to be flowing hot and heavy, but we are going to be here to make sure the facts are brought forth and that the arguments that are used to base a decision on the issue will in fact be available for all of our colleagues.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WISE moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the privileged motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 150, nays 261, not voting 23, as follows:

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—150

Gejdenson
Gibbons
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hinchee
Holden
Hoyer
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Klink
LaFalce
Laughlin
Levin
Lincoln
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar

NAYS—261

Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk

Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeltton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wise
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

Kim	Myers	Shays
King	Myrick	Skeen
Kingston	Nethercutt	Smith (MI)
Kleccka	Neumann	Smith (NJ)
Klug	Ney	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Norwood	Smith (WA)
Kolbe	Nussle	Solomon
LaHood	Oxley	Souder
Largent	Packard	Spence
Latham	Parker	Stearns
LaTourette	Paxon	Stockman
Lazio	Petri	Stump
Leach	Pickett	Talent
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Tanner
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Tauzin
Lightfoot	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Linder	Poshard	Taylor (NC)
Lipinski	Pryce	Tejeda
Livingston	Quillen	Thomas
LoBiondo	Quinn	Thornberry
Longley	Radanovich	Thornton
Lucas	Rahall	Tiahrt
Luther	Ramstad	Torkildsen
Manzullo	Regula	Trafigant
Martini	Roberts	Upton
McCollum	Roemer	Vucanovich
McCrery	Rogers	Waldholtz
McDade	Rohrabacher	Walker
McHale	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McHugh	Roth	Wamp
McInnis	Roukema	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Royce	Weldon (FL)
McKeon	Salmon	Weldon (PA)
Menendez	Sanford	Weller
Metcalf	Saxton	White
Meyers	Scarborough	Whitfield
Mica	Schaefer	Wicker
Miller (FL)	Schiff	Williams
Minge	Scott	Wolf
Molinari	Seastrand	Woolsey
Moorhead	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Morella	Shadegg	Zeliff
Murtha	Shaw	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra	Horn	Schumer
Blute	Kasich	Shuster
Clinger	Lantos	Tate
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Torricelli
Dornan	Moran	Towns
Flake	Payne (NJ)	Wilson
Gephardt	Riggs	Young (AK)
Hilliard	Rose	

□ 1159

Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. LUTHER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to revitalize the national security of the United States. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendment in the nature of substitute made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided among and controlled by the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committee on International Relations

and the Committee on National Security. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed ten hours. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 872. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause (5)(a) of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instruction.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

My colleagues, this is a very, very busy period of time. We are producing a great deal of legislation. We are doing it always constantly under time constraints.

Certainly, all the Members are to be appreciated for the efforts they make not only on the floor but in their committees. It is a rigorous time period.

We have an opportunity to be out of here by 3 p.m. tomorrow and have a period of time for a rest and family and district work period, where we can perhaps all get a chance to sort of refresh ourselves before we come back to work.

Let me just say, it is the resolve of the leadership that we will complete this bill before we leave here. We believe we have every opportunity to do so in such a manner that Members can make a 3 o'clock flight tomorrow afternoon and begin that rest period. We intend to make that flight period.

We are prepared, on the other hand, if it is necessary, to work through the night. And should we, even under those circumstances, fail to complete the bill by our desired 3 o'clock departure time tomorrow, we are prepared to accept

the necessity of keeping Members as late after 3 o'clock tomorrow as is necessary.

The bottom line is that our resolve to pass this bill before we depart town is so great that we will do whatever it takes to do so.

Now, we believe that it should be quite comfortably done by a fairly early rise this evening and a 3 o'clock departure tomorrow, if everything goes smoothly. And that is what we hope and expect. But the Members should be prepared to check their travel arrangements for the unlikely possibility that they may not make their planes tomorrow.

In any event, we will complete this bill. The bottom line point is very clear, and we must not be mistaken. We will complete this bill before we depart town.

I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7, the National Security Revitalization Act of 1995. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on National Security.

The rule provides for 10 full hours of debate on the amendment process. It makes in order the text of H.R. 872, which is considered as read, as the original bill for amendment purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule accords priority recognition to Members who have had their amendments preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but does not prevent other amendments which were not printed from being considered.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions, a right we guarantee to the minority in our new rules, even though we never received the same guarantees from the Democrats when they were in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, I made a good-faith effort, as did the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, for 3 days running to reach accommodation with our minority colleagues on the amount of time that would be made available for consideration of amendments. We were willing to extend consideration of amendments by several hours, if we were then to be given unanimous consent to come in earlier on Wednesday, that is today, and on Thursday, tomorrow. That offer was not accepted by the Democrat leadership.

I regret that the good intentions of Members on both sides of the aisle did not prove sufficient to overcome the obstacles put up by some other Members. Accordingly, there are 10 hours allocated for the amendment process. That is too bad, because we could have had 14, 15, 16 hours in that process.