

in health care costs, the insurers, the facilities, and even some of the physicians. What we need is a reform that affects everyone, where everyone contributes a reasonable share to balancing the budget, to achieving what has got to be our Nation's foremost objective. The President's plan does that in 10 years, it does it in a responsible way, one that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle ought to support.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE**

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Commerce, and Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have been consulted about this request. We have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 167 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 167

*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. 1817) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 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. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. (a) For purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as they apply in the House of Representatives to the Committee on Appropriations and to the consideration of general appropriation bills, amendments thereto, or conference reports thereon, the Congress shall be considered to have adopted House Concurrent Resolution 67 in the form adopted by the House on May 18, 1995.

(b) The allocations of spending and credit responsibilities to the Committee on Appropriations that are depicted in House Report 104-120, beginning on page 144, shall be considered as the allocations required by section 602(a) of that Act to be included in the joint explanatory statement of the managers on a conference report to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(c) This section shall cease to apply upon final adoption by the House and the Senate of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

□ 1020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 167 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislation in an appropriations bill, and also waives clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting reappropriations, against provisions of the bill.

Additionally, the rule provides that the spending and credit allocations to the Committee on Appropriations con-

tained in the House-passed budget resolution shall apply for budget act enforcement purposes until final adoption of a budget resolution. Under the rule, the chair may accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the waivers provided in this rule are necessary since the defense authorization bill has not yet become law. I'm not aware of any objection to such waivers, and there was bipartisan support for this rule by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and by the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a special occasion that deserves proper recognition. As Members know, our colleague from Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, is the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction. She is the first woman to chair an appropriations subcommittee in 40 years. And all I can say, Mr. Speaker, it is about time and I cannot think of anyone more deserving of this distinction than Mrs. VUCANOVICH. She has served this Congress with dedication and commitment for over 12 years, and she is one of the most highly respected Members of the House. I applaud her hard work and bipartisan spirit in working together with the ranking minority member, BILL HEFNER, in bringing forward this first of the 13 appropriation bills. They did an outstanding job of addressing the important housing needs, base realignment and closure costs, and construction requirements of the military.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that about one-eighth of all military families living off-base reside in substandard housing. Additionally, more than one-half of the on-base family housing units are unsuitable and in need of significant repair. We've all heard stories of military families whose standard of living is so low they qualify for food stamps. This is deplorable, and we have an obligation to ensure an adequate lifestyle for those patriotic, dedicated men and women who have chosen to serve this country and are willing to put their lives on the line to defend America.

About 72 percent of the projects in this bill are for the construction of new barracks, family housing, and child development centers—money well spent in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, this open rule will allow all Members to fully participate in the amendment process, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following materials for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS  
[As of June 15, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open <sup>2</sup>	46	44	29	74
Modified Closed <sup>3</sup>	49	47	10	26
Closed <sup>4</sup>	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	39	100

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.  
<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.  
<sup>3</sup> A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.  
<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS  
[As of June 15, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1.	Balanced Budget Amdt.	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif.	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	O	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95).
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95).
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95).
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95).
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95).
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95).
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Natl. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95).
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1517	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I many consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has described, House Resolution 167 is the rule waiving points of order against provisions of the bill, H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The rule is essentially an open rule with 1 hour of general debate. It does provide waivers of clause 2 of rule XXI to allow unauthorized appropriations in the bill, as well as clause 6 of rule XXI prohibiting reappropriations. It also provides that figures in the House-passed budget resolution shall apply until final adoption of the budget resolution. There was no substantial opposition to these provisions from witnesses in yesterday's Rules Committee hearing.

In the Rules Committee hearing, however, Representatives BREWSTER and HARMAN did request an amendment known as the deficit reduction lockbox amendment. This would have allowed any savings obtained through floor votes to go into a special deficit reduction trust fund. Given the interest that many of us have in deficit reduction, I believe the Rules Committee should have made the Brewster-Harman amendment in order. Our ranking minority member, Representative JOE MOAKLEY, did offer the lockbox measure as an amendment to the rule. However, it unfortunately lost 8 to 3, with no Republican support.

Mr. Speaker, this bill appropriates approximately \$11.2 billion for fiscal year 1996 for military construction, family housing, and base realignments and closures for the Department of Defense. The bill appropriates approximately \$4.3 billion for family housing, \$3.89 billion for base realignment and closure costs, \$2.8 billion for military

construction, and \$161 million for NATO security.

Also included in the bill is approximately \$18.5 million in funding for several projects at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is partially located in my congressional district. I am pleased that the committee approved these funds which will continue several projects, including an electrical upgrade at the base. Mr. Speaker, these projects are important to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and to the community of Dayton, OH, which has been a world leader in aviation since the days of the Wright brothers. I commend my colleagues for including them.

Mr. Speaker, under the normal rules of the House, any amendment which does not violate any House rules could be offered to H.R. 1817. The rule was passed out of the House Rules Committee by voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

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

distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman emeritus for yielding me the time. The rule certainly has been adequately explained by both the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], so I will not get into that. I will speak to the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, the military construction bill this rule makes in order will have a major impact on the morale and the quality of life of our young men and women who serve in our military today, and that is so critically important in maintaining a high quality of recruits, especially when we have to depend on an all-voluntary military as we do today.

We presently face a seriously worsening situation with respect to military housing, and this is a problem that simply must be solved if we are going to keep these young men and women in the service.

We cannot hope to recruit and then retain a high-caliber all-volunteer force if our service men and women are consigned to live in housing that we would not let our own families live in. This is how bad it is.

An estimated one-eighth of all military families residing off-base today are living in substandard housing, and that is terrible. More than half of all of our on-base family housing units are considered unsuitable and in need of significant repair.

Mr. Speaker, these are shocking and absolutely unacceptable conditions. I am pleased to note that funding in this bill for family housing is up 23 percent over last year. We found the money. This is so vital for the 60 percent of our service personnel who are married.

I am pleased to see that this bill provides the seed money for a 5-year pilot project involving the private sector to replace or renovate most or all of the on-base family housing units that are in dire need of repair today.

With Armed Forces composed entirely of volunteers, we find that our military personnel are staying in the service longer, they are marrying while in service, many of them are trying to raise families, and that is the way it should be.

There is an increase in this bill for the building and renovating of barracks that are used by our military personnel who are not married. This situation also needs to be addressed, because half of all existing barracks today are 30, 40, 50, and even 60 years old, and they are in a deplorable condition. We have a deficit on top of that of 160,000 barracks spaces to provide for quarters for these people.

So, I am just really grateful for the many good and necessary improvements made in this bill. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and all of the members of her subcommittee for bringing a really quality product to the floor

today. The investment we make today to improve the quality of life for our military personnel will pay off in the future, because we will find it much easier to recruit and retain and keep these good people that are serving us.

Having said all of that, I just want to again repeat what my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], said about the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. In bringing the military construction bill to the floor this week, my good friend from Nevada, who was formerly from my area up in upstate New York, the gentlewoman from Nevada, will become the first woman in 40 years to manage an appropriations bill in the House of Representatives. That is significant.

And as best as the staff of the Committee on Appropriations can tell, she will be only the second woman in the entire history of the House to have that responsibility. So, we salute the gentlewoman, let her come down here, and let us get this good bill going.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule for a variety of reasons, starting with the fact that this bill itself is unbelievably \$2.5 billion above last year, even while we are told that we have to reach a balanced budget which requires us to cut most programs in the budget over a 7-year period by about 30 percent.

It is to me incredibly irresponsible to be suggesting that we can raise any appropriation bill by more than 20 percent in a single year, given the budget squeeze we are facing.

But I think there is an even more basic reason to oppose this rule and that is because this rule would, in its passage, have it deemed that we had already passed the budget resolution when in fact that is not the case.

This bill is coming to the floor 2 weeks after the first appropriation bill came to the floor last year. There is still no budget which has been adopted by the majority party. This is the latest in 10 years that the Congress has been without the adoption of a budget.

Because we are still not operating under a budget, this rule would have the House, in essence, declare that it is simply the House budget resolution which is going to govern the appropriation process for the rest of the year, when we know full well that that resolution is going to have to be compromised with the Senate and a different set of numbers will be reached.

An added problem is that the budget priorities under which we are acting, and under which this bill is brought to the floor, are in fact grossly warped. While this bill is going to be \$2.5 billion above last year, the Labor-Health-Education appropriation bill will be about \$10 billion below last year, cutting a \$70 billion bill to \$60 billion.

You will see a savaging of the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program. You will see a merciless squeezing of

job training programs, of health appropriations, including a potentially very large squeeze on the National Institutes of Health. It just seems to me that that is an incredibly warped set of priorities.

I tried in the full Committee on Appropriations to get a different set of 602 allocations adopted for the subcommittee so that we could produce a different set of priorities. Instead of the outlandishly high military budget which is being enforced under this process, I suggested we simply go to what I would call Domenici-plus-one, which would say that we would limit defense expenditures to \$1 billion above that provided in the Senate budget resolution. That is hardly a left-wing proposition.

That level was supported by a number of well-known conservatives in the Senate who I would name if House rules allowed me to; conservatives in both parties. It would have allowed us, by limiting that defense expenditure to those levels, to provide \$900 million in additional support for law enforcement programs under Commerce-Justice, it would have allowed us to provide \$1 billion more for highway construction that will be allowed under the proposal which was presented by the majority.

We would be allowed to provide \$2 billion more to the VA-HUD bill to protect veterans' medical services and to help low-income seniors who otherwise are going to be clobbered in housing budgets.

It would have allowed \$100 million more to be used to toughen immigration enforcement. It would have allowed a saving of about a half-billion dollars on the squeeze that will otherwise be put in national parks, and it would have allowed us to reduce the incredible reductions which are going to be forced on student assistance, on biomedical research, and grants to local school districts and fuel-assistance programs as I indicated.

But because this resolution deems us to be operating under the House budget resolution, and because under that House budget resolution these warped set of priorities have been adopted, we cannot proceed to produce a more balanced set of appropriation bills if we proceed under this approach.

I want to make clear, I am not talking about spending one additional dime above the spending levels suggested by the Republican Party, by the majority party. What I am suggesting is that the way the dollars are allocated under the ceiling which we are all going to have to live with is grossly warped and this resolution, by deeming us to be operating under that procedure, simply guarantees that we cannot make any improvements in the situation.

I do not think we ought to do that. I think this rule ought to be defeated so that the entire proposal can be recommended to the Committee on Appropriations so that the committee can produce a different set of numbers which provide a greater sense of mercy and justice for working families who

are trying to help their kids go through school, for families who have health problems, for workers who need retraining, rather than sticking to the spending priorities which we are going to be required to stick to under this proposal.

□ 1040

So I would urge you to defeat the previous question on the rule, defeat the rule, send this whole proposition back to the Committee on Appropriations so we can produce a much more balanced set of spending priorities in a very tight fiscal year.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order an amendment to cut out what is a relatively small amount of money to purchase land for the construction of the U.S. Army Museum.

Now, if this were another time, if we were not all so much aware of the fiscal realities, the Army would have gone about this in the way that the other armed services have and, in fact, every other nation has, and build it with public funds. But the Army is not asking for public funds to build the U.S. Army Museum. The museum is going to cost about \$72 million, and the Army is going to raise that through private donations. That is the kind of thing we have been encouraging the public sector to do, not to spend any money that is not absolutely necessary.

The small amount of money, however, that is in this appropriations bill, and we appreciate the fact that the chairperson of the appropriations bill, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], included it, is necessary because we cannot possibly raise enough money to purchase the land immediately and it has to be purchased immediately. Equitable Real Estate, that owns it, has plans to develop two highrise office buildings on this site.

Now, let me describe where it is because all of you have seen this site. It is on the gateway to Washington, DC. It is kitty-corner to the Jefferson Memorial, across the river, and it is on a line between the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial, and what would be the Army Museum. It is a small piece of land, just to the east of the 14th Street Bridge. Everyone will see it as they enter Washington.

The small amount of money that is necessary will enable us to purchase this land at a very reasonable cost, and then the Army will go about raising money for the museum.

The Army has about 500,000 artifacts to show. Most of them are warehoused. Nobody can see them. Many of them are priceless. The Army has a story to tell, the history of the United States, how the Army secured this Nation's liberty through war and sustained it through preparation for war in a responsible manner, and all of those junctures where the Army made major

decisions are going to be highlighted in this museum. It will have an inestimable value for the esprit de corps, not just of the Army but of all the armed services.

And we know that there will be 20 million American citizens who will be visiting this museum every year. It has perpetual value. That is why this small amount of money is very important, and it is important that we include it in an appropriations bill, not vote for the amendment that would eliminate it.

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

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. I certainly agree with your position on the Army Museum. As a matter of fact, it is only an appropriation to buy the land because all else is going to be built by donations. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORAN. That is correct, I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Is it not also correct that all of the other services have a national type of museum but the U.S. Army does not?

Mr. MORAN. They do. And it is ironic that the Army has the most to show, things dating back to the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the War of 1812, unbelievable things that this country has no awareness of the fact that we have these and would like to show them to the public.

Mr. SKELTON. I certainly agree and compliment you on your position.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER].

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

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and would urge my deficit hawk colleagues to oppose this rule as well.

There has been much discussion in this Chamber about the importance of deficit reduction and balancing the budget. Mr. Speaker, this House needs to put its money where its mouth is.

This rule restricts the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment, which would guarantee all savings achieved from cuts in this bill would go solely for deficit reduction—savings could not be used for additional spending.

Mr. Speaker, if this House votes to cut a program on the floor, then I feel—as I think a majority of this House feels—that those savings should go only to deficit reduction, not be spent somewhere else. The Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment would guarantee this savings.

Only a few months ago, this House overwhelmingly voted to pass the lockbox amendment, 418 to 5. With that kind of support, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed the Rules Committee did not continue the commitment of deficit reduction. Instead, they restricted the Brewster-Harman lockbox from this bill.

This is the first of 13 appropriations bills to come to the House floor this year. We must not wait any longer by letting millions of discretionary dollars slip into the wasteland of Federal spending. Let us make our cuts count.

Vote "no" on this rule, and let us send H.R. 1817 back to the Rules Committee and make the Brewster-Harman lockbox in order.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Deficit hawks listen up: I am the Harman of Brewster-Harman, and this is the vote you have been waiting for.

By excluding the lockbox, the Committee on Rules is telling us that on the first appropriations bill of the season we are not prepared, let me repeat, not prepared, to force cuts to go to deficit reduction.

A little later today we are going to consider at least two cuts to this bill. Should they pass, I am telling your now that without the lockbox, they will not, hear me, not go to deficit reduction.

Why not? The answer is that the appropriators, both sides, and this is not a partisan claim, do not want to lose the ability to use saved money for other pet projects.

Let me explain how the lockbox, which an overwhelming majority of this House has already supported, works. It works this way: If we cut money from an appropriations bill and we do not at the same time on the public record reprogram it to something else, that money automatically goes into what we call a lockbox. When the House passes its bill, the lockbox contains our cuts. When the Senate passes its bill, the lockbox contains the Senate's cuts. And then in conference the conferees are limited, limited by this mechanism to coming up with a bottom-line figure that is somewhere between the House and the Senate cuts. In other words, the money cut cannot be reprogrammed. They money cut goes to deficit reduction.

This concept is overwhelmingly popular out in the land and, in fact, it is probably a better mechanism, or at least a faster mechanism, than the balanced budget amendment because it goes into effect immediately with enactment of the appropriations bill.

And I say that as a strong supporter in this Congress, and in the last Congress, of the balanced budget amendment.

Let me conclude by saying this: Casting tough votes means casting votes that could hurt at home, and this is the case for me. Most people here know, and I always say it, I represent the aerospace center of the universe, California's 36th Congressional District. I am a strong defense hawk. I spoke for and voted for the plus-ups in the defense budget because I believe in them.

I certainly believe in spending on military construction.

But I also believe in two other things, and they are relevant today. One is candor. If we are serious about cutting the deficit, let us do it. And the second one is making sure that when I stand here and say that something really is deficit reduction, it really is.

And so I tell my constituents right now that by doing this, by voting against this rule and by voting against this bill, I am fighting for you because I am fighting for deficit reduction and candor in this House.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in strong opposition not only to the rule but to this bill, and I say, "Wake up, America. Stay tuned America," because under this bill and the next defense appropriation bill, we are going to spend a whole bunch of money. We are going to have increases in that spending, and at the same time, under the Republican budget, you are going to see cuts, drastic cuts, radical cuts in Medicare for our senior citizens. We are going to see programs such as the heating assistance for the poor in my district cut out completely, but we are going to see, like I said, spending increases in defense.

There is no shared sacrifice here. The reasons that you have to cut the Medicare as they cut Medicare is not only the defense increases but also because they have in their budget a big tax break for the wealthy, a \$20,000 tax break, \$20,000 a year for people making over \$250,000. That is not strengthening Medicare. That is not improving Medicare. That is not making Medicare any better. That is making it harder on my senior citizens, my rural hospitals.

I have got rural hospitals out there that right now estimate that it is going to be over a million-dollar loss in revenue to them by the end of this century just because you can give tax breaks to the wealthy and you can increase defense spending.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this movement of the Republican radical majority in order to take it out of the hides of the elderly and give it to our defense spending and to the wealthy.

For that reason, I oppose the rule, and I oppose the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about this rule because it does not allow the lockbox. It does not allow us to vote on the lockbox.

I am concerned about that because I have an amendment which would delete \$14 million from this bill which would go to build or to purchase land here in Washington, DC, for another Army Museum. This is another.

Another Army Museum, folks, would be the 49th Army Museum in this country. I cannot understand why we want to build a 49th museum right here in Washington when we have got American men and women who are needing training, who have family housing that is just unacceptable.

I think too many people have been talking to the generals and the brass, and they ought to get out there and talk to the men and women who serve in this Army and they ought to talk to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I just think it is a shame, and I cannot wait for us to vote on the cutting of the money for the Army Museum, but I sure wish it was being locked into deficit reduction or could be sent somewhere else, like family housing.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 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 am going to vote with my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], on the previous question, but that is not because I am opposed to this rule. I want to commend the chairman. I will support the rule, and I will give the procedural vote to my party.

But I want to say this: Pigs get fat, hogs get slaughtered.

There is a way to go about this business in this whole process, and I want to thank the Committee on Appropriations for funding the three projects I had requested at the Air Force base, reserve base in Vienna, OH, to my ranking member, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and all the chairmen responsible, the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], thank you, but you see, I did it the right way. I requested it. And then it was evaluated, and then it was scrutinized, justified, then it was authorized, and then it went to the appropriators, and I showed that process, and I showed the importance of it and the merit of it, and it was funded.

And the process can work if we first authorize, justify, scrutinize.

And I am going to support this bill.

As long as the appropriators are including those issues that are properly addressed through the authorizing process, you will have my vote.

I appreciate that, and I want to thank the chairman from Ohio for giving me the time.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to stand up and speak right now because I am so agitated.

But, you know, I hear all of these new-found deficit hawks up here talking. And I have the National Taxpayers Union ratings here for the last 16 years, and I guess we know who the deficit

hawks are and who are not. I do not have much faith in new deficit hawks because if they were really deficit hawks, they would be up here voting for cuts day in and day out, like you do, Mr. Acting Speaker.

As a matter of fact, later this afternoon I am going to be introducing a piece of legislation that is about as thick as my briefcase is here. It is \$840 billion in spending cuts, and I am telling you it cuts just about everything and it brings the deficit under control that is killing this country, that is literally ruining the country.

We are going to give this, this bill which is this thick, we are going to give it to all of the appropriators and to any other of the 435 Members. They can take little pieces of the bills as these appropriations bills come down and all of the other bills and the reconciliation, and they can take it, you can, Mr. Speaker, or I can, anyone can take one little section. It is all there in legislative language, so all Members have got to do is come to me or come to the bill drafting office, and they have it there for you. They will give it to you, the specific amendment you want.

So the point is, let us see who the real deficit hawks are.

Now, I happen to support the Army Museum because it is a small amount of money. Somebody said, "Well, \$14 million is not a small amount of money." But it is because it is the seed money which will bring the Army Museum about.

I do not see amendments up here wiping out the Korean War Memorial. We are going to have an opening on April 27. We are going to have those who served in the military during the Korean war. We are going to have them coming to Washington. It is going to be a great day because we are going to honor those Korean war veterans. I did not serve in combat myself. I served in the United States Marine Corps during that period of time. It is going to be so gratifying to see that war memorial finished for those veterans who did, especially for the lives lost there.

All of these artifacts that the Army has, my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] was talking about, what is wrong with having a museum for the people who served, whether in World War I or World War II or the Korean war or the Vietnam war? Why can they not have a place to come? I think it is terribly important.

The bill also then allows for the volunteers to come out and raise money, like we did for the Korean War Memorial, like we did there.

I am going to tell you one thing: I hope no Republican votes for that cut when it is offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] or anybody else. I expect them to let that bill pass and let us get that war memorial built.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BROWDER. Would my friend tell me, do you know whether the Citizens Against Government Waste favor that expenditure for these, for this Army Museum, or oppose it, the Citizens Against Government Waste?

Mr. SOLOMON. I have got their ratings for however long they have been in effect. Yes, you are right, they do, and maybe the National Taxpayers Union. But sometimes they flake off, you know, too. They do it sometimes on some of these silly environmental laws sometimes. We know where this thing stands.

I want every Republican to come to this floor and vote against the Browder amendment, and I hope some good Democrats over there do, too. I know a few that will.

Mr. BROWDER. I thank the gentleman for admitting that the Citizens Against Government Waste are opposed to this museum.

Mr. SOLOMON. Now let me make one more point. We are trying to leave here by 2 o'clock at the request of all of the family-friendly Members, as my colleagues know. Where is my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]? He is up here every Friday wanting us to be family friendly, and we want to be. We are trying to get out of here at 2 o'clock this afternoon because there are a lot of Members who really need to go home this weekend to talk about Medicare and other things to their senior citizens. They are going to miss those planes if we go much longer.

Now there is a previous question coming on something called the lockbox. Now I happen to be a strong supporter of the lockbox, but the truth of the matter is, if we allow that amendment to go through today, it would be knocked out on a point of order even if the previous question is defeated, even if it is defeated. So it is a wasted vote. My colleagues would be wasting the time of the Democrats and the Republicans.

I say to my colleagues, If you don't like the way the rule is written, it's an open rule. Any Member can offer any kind of germane amendment that he wants if you don't like that, then vote against the rule. That's your prerogative, but don't waste the body's time with this previous question that's going to add another 35 to 40 minutes to the debate today, and all of these Members are not going to be able to get home on time for the weekend and do those kinds of things for their constituents.

So I would urge my colleagues, please support the previous question and vote how you want to on the rule. That's your prerogative.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the former chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, a great American, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and,

about the Browder amendment, it should be pointed up in this war museum that the gentleman from Alabama is trying to eliminate there will be a section in there honoring the National Guard and Reserve, and I point out that in World War II, the 29th Division, it was a National Guard division, that 2,000 young men, National Guardsmen, lost their lives landing at Omaha Beach, and they will be honored in this museum, and they ought to know that, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, they most certainly will, and when that museum opens, I want to go with the gentleman to be the first ones to visit.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to my very good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding.

Let me just ask my colleagues from New York on the Browder amendment: Isn't it true we're going to get over \$5 in contributions for every dollar we invest in this museum?

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely, because the American people live by the words "pride, patriotism and volunteerism." The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. DAVIS. And I understand there are over 500,000 artifacts sitting out there now, and some of these, frankly, face the fact that they could be lost over time if we do not find a permanent place for them.

Mr. SOLOMON. They could be lost, and also they could deteriorate and be destroyed.

Mr. DAVIS. And I guess the last question to ask is: The particular piece of property that we have in mind is, of course, adjacent to the Capitol and Arlington Cemetery in those areas, but we may lose this piece if we don't act within this next year; isn't that correct?

Mr. SOLOMON. It could very well be so. We almost even did not get the space for the Korean War Memorial.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I plan to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in opposing the amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good bill, and I support the bill.

Let us set one thing straight for the Committee on Rules. They could have crafted a rule that would have done no harm to this bill, that would have made in order the lockbox amendment. That is a pretty bold assessment that they are putting up here. It could have been in order, would have done no harm to this bill, and it would have done what the people who had signed on to the lockbox amendment long ago wanted. It was absolutely done away

with in the budget considerations, so let us not say it would have been out of order. It could have been in order but for the rule that was crafted. They could have crafted a rule that would have made it in perfect order for the lockbox amendment to be offered in this bill, and it would have done no damage to the military construction bill.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me just say that the gentleman just does not understand the rule, that if the previous question were defeated and do not interrupt me, if the previous question were defeated, and then this was brought back to make this in order, it would, in my opinion, still be subject to a point of order. I cannot speak for the Parliamentarian, but from all previous precedents I know that that would be ruled out of order, and it would not be back here.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that that was not the question. If we could have passed the amendment in the Committee on Rules yesterday that was voted down, I believe 8 to 3, it would have been in order to offer this amendment with the proper waivers, and that was the question that he asked, not if, in fact, we defeat this previous question.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand a lot of things around here, but I do understand rules. I have been in this House for 20 years, so for the gentleman to tell me I do not understand the rules is a little bit ludicrous.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just tell the gentleman I have been here for just about as long, and, if he looks at all these rules here, we can all stand a little learning sometime.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any more speakers. I would only say that I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and, if the previous question is defeated, I would offer an amendment that would make in order the Brewster-Harman deficit reduction lockbox amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Proposed amendment to House Resolution 167: At the end of the resolution, add the following:

"SEC. 3. Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, an amendment on the subject of the deficit reduction lockbox to be offered by Representative Brewster of Oklahoma and Representative Harman of California and submitted to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD no later than June 16, 1995."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of 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 adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 180, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—223

Allard	Cunningham	Hobson
Armey	Davis	Hoekstra
Bachus	DeLoe	Hoke
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Horn
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Barr	Dornan	Houghton
Barrett (NE)	Dreier	Hunter
Bartlett	Duncan	Hutchinson
Barton	Dunn	Hyde
Bass	Ehlers	Inglis
Bateman	Emerson	Istook
Bereuter	English	Johnson (CT)
Bilbray	Ensign	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Everett	Jones
Bliley	Ewing	Kasich
Blute	Fawell	Kelly
Boehlert	Fields (TX)	Kim
Boehner	Flanagan	King
Bonilla	Foley	Kingston
Bono	Forbes	Klug
Brownback	Fowler	Knollenberg
Bryant (TN)	Fox	Kolbe
Bunn	Franks (CT)	LaHood
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	Latham
Burr	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Burton	Frisa	Lazio
Buyer	Funderburk	Leach
Callahan	Ganske	Lewis (CA)
Calvert	Gekas	Lewis (KY)
Camp	Gilchrest	Lightfoot
Canady	Gillmor	Linder
Castle	Gilman	Livingston
Chabot	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Chambliss	Goodling	Longley
Chenoweth	Goss	Lucas
Christensen	Graham	Manzullo
Chrysler	Greenwood	Martini
Clinger	Gunderson	McCollum
Coble	Gutknecht	McCrery
Coburn	Hancock	McDade
Collins (GA)	Hansen	McHugh
Combust	Hastert	McInnis
Cooley	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh
Cox	Hayworth	McKeon
Crane	Hefley	Metcalfe
Crapo	Heineman	Meyers
Cremeans	Herger	Mica
Cubin	Hilleary	Miller (FL)

Molinari	Rohrabacher
Moorhead	Ros-Lehtinen
Morella	Rose
Myers	Roth
Myrick	Roukema
Nethercutt	Royce
Neumann	Salmon
Ney	Sanford
Norwood	Saxton
Nussle	Scarborough
Oxley	Schaefer
Packard	Schiff
Paxon	Seastrand
Petri	Sensenbrenner
Pickett	Shadegg
Pombo	Shaw
Porter	Shays
Portman	Shuster
Pryce	Skeen
Quillen	Smith (MI)
Quinn	Smith (TX)
Radanovich	Smith (WA)
Ramstad	Solomon
Regula	Souder
Riggs	Spence
Roberts	Stearns
Rogers	Stockman

NAYS—180

Abercrombie	Gordon	Olver
Andrews	Green	Ortiz
Bailes	Gutierrez	Orton
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Owens
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hamilton	Pastor
Becerra	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Bishop	Holden	Poshard
Bonior	Hoyer	Rahall
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Boucher	Jacobs	Reed
Brewster	Johnson (SD)	Reynolds
Browder	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Clement	Kennelly	Sanders
Clyburn	Kildee	Sawyer
Coleman	Klink	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Scott
Condit	Lantos	Serrano
Conyers	Laughlin	Sisisky
Costello	Levin	Skaggs
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Danner	Lincoln	Slaughter
de la Garza	Lipinski	Spratt
DeFazio	Lofgren	Stark
DeLauro	Lowey	Stenholm
Dellums	Luther	Studds
Deutsch	Maloney	Stupak
Dicks	Manton	Tanner
Dingell	Markey	Tauzin
Dixon	Martinez	Tejeda
Doggett	Mascara	Thompson
Doyle	McCarthy	Thurman
Durbin	McDermott	Torres
Edwards	McHale	Torricelli
Engel	McKinney	Towns
Eshoo	McNulty	Traficant
Evans	Meehan	Velazquez
Farr	Meek	Vento
Fattah	Menendez	Visclosky
Fazio	Mfume	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Miller (CA)	Ward
Filner	Minge	Waters
Foglietta	Mink	Watt (NC)
Ford	Mollohan	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Montgomery	Williams
Frost	Moran	Wilson
Furse	Murtha	Wise
Gedjenson	Nadler	Woolsey
Geren	Neal	Wyden
Gibbons	Oberstar	Wynn
Gonzalez	Obey	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—31

Ackerman	Dickey	Jefferson
Archer	Dooley	Klecza
Baker (LA)	Doolittle	Largent
Chapman	Ehrlich	Matsui
Clay	Flake	Mineta
Clayton	Gallegly	Moakley
Collins (IL)	Gephardt	Parker
Coyne	Hayes	Pelosi

Schumer	Thornton	Yates
Smith (NJ)	Torkildsen	
Stokes	Tucker	

□ 1126

Mr. WARD and Mr. VISCLOSKEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 155, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—245

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Kasich
Allard	Dornan	Kelly
Archer	Dreier	Kim
Armey	Duncan	King
Bachus	Dunn	Kingston
Baker (CA)	Emerson	Klug
Ballenger	English	Knollenberg
Barr	Ensign	Kolbe
Barrett (NE)	Everett	LaHood
Bartlett	Ewing	Latham
Barton	Fawell	LaTourette
Bass	Fields (TX)	Laughlin
Bateman	Flanagan	Lazio
Bereuter	Foley	Leach
Bevill	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Ford	Lightfoot
Bilirakis	Fowler	Linder
Bliley	Fox	Livingston
Blute	Franks (CT)	LoBiondo
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen	Longley
Boehner	Frisa	Lucas
Bonilla	Funderburk	Manzullo
Bono	Ganske	Martini
Brownback	Gekas	McCollum
Bryant (TN)	Gilchrest	McCrery
Bunn	Gillmor	McDade
Bunning	Gilman	McHugh
Burr	Goodlatte	McInnis
Burton	Goodling	McIntosh
Buyer	Goss	McKeon
Callahan	Graham	McNulty
Calvert	Greenwood	Metcalfe
Camp	Gunderson	Meyers
Canady	Gutknecht	Mica
Castle	Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hancock	Molinari
Chambliss	Hansen	Mollohan
Chenoweth	Hastert	Montgomery
Christensen	Hastings (WA)	Moorhead
Chrysler	Hayworth	Morella
Clinger	Hefley	Murtha
Coble	Hefner	Myers
Coburn	Heineman	Myrick
Coleman	Herger	Nethercutt
Collins (GA)	Hilleary	Neumann
Combust	Hobson	Ney
Cooley	Hoekstra	Norwood
Cox	Hoke	Nussle
Cramer	Horn	Ortiz
Crane	Hostettler	Oxley
Crapo	Houghton	Packard
Cremeans	Hunter	Parker
Cubin	Hutchinson	Paxon
Cunningham	Hyde	Petri
Davis	Inglis	Pickett
Deal	Istook	Pombo
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Portman
Dicks	Jones	Pryce

Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano

Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas

Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torricelli  
Traficant  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff

## NOES—155

Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Danner  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Foglietta  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson

Geren  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Luther  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Minge  
Mink  
Moran  
Nadler

Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Scott  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Towns  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Ward  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman  
Baker (LA)  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Collins (IL)  
Coyne  
Dickey  
Dooley  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Flake

Gallegly  
Gephardt  
Hayes  
Jefferson  
Klecza  
Largent  
Lewis (CA)  
Maloney  
Matsui  
Mineta  
Moakley  
Pelosi

Royce  
Schumer  
Smith (NJ)  
Stokes  
Thornton  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Tucker  
Waters  
Yates

## □ 1135

Mr. HALL of Ohio changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable absence, today I missed rollcall vote No. 386, ordering the previous question, and rollcall vote No. 387, on House Resolution 167. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on each of those rollcall votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 167 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1817.

## □ 1136

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman and inform the membership that not only is this bill historic, but, in fact, the moment we are about to experience here with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chair of the Subcommittee on Military Construction handling this bill, is a truly historic moment for women and for men in our country, because, in fact, as she moves this bill today, this will only be the second time in the 200-year history of our country that a woman has chaired any of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, which is an exclusive committee.

The last such woman to handle such a bill was Julia Butler Hansen of Washington State who, at the age of 67, retired from this institution and chaired the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies at the end of her career.

I just want to congratulate the gentlewoman. The road here is still a dif-

ficult one for women and to rise and chair one of the most exclusive subcommittees is truly an honor. We are proud of you. Good luck with the bill and congratulations to the people of Nevada for sending you here.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewomen for those remarks. All we need to do now is get along with this and get this done.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present to the House the recommendations for the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. The funding contained in this bill reflects only 4 percent of the total defense authorization passed by the House yesterday, totals \$11.2 billion, and is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. This represents a \$500 million increase over the President's request and a \$2.5 billion increase over fiscal year 1995.

Only recently has public attention been given to the problems our subcommittee has been citing for several years: the quality and deficit of military family housing for our military personnel, the necessity for support facilities for our service members and their families, and the importance of providing an adequate working environment to improve productivity and readiness. The committee has heard testimony from many different spectrums regarding these problems—and, we continue to feel strongly that the funds in this bill significantly contribute to the readiness and retention of our military personnel.

The appropriation and authorization committees have worked closely to provide for the number one priority of the military—quality of life for the men, women and their families, who voluntarily serve. Not one single project is included in this bill that was not included in the authorization bill which passed yesterday.

There is no question that there is a crisis in providing adequate housing. I cannot emphasize enough what an important role this plays in retention and readiness. This is the number one concern of our military personnel. Many barracks still contain gang latrines, suffer from inadequate heating and cooling, corroded pipes, electrical systems which fail and peeling lead-based paint. Continuous maintenance is required. Over 600,000 men and women are living in troop housing and about one half of the barracks were built 30 or more years ago, with an average age of 40 years. of this inventory, over one fourth are considered substandard, and the Department estimates it will take up to 40 years at a cost of \$8.5 billion to correct these deficiencies.

The situation with family housing is not much better. Two-thirds of the 350,000 family housing units in DOD's inventory are over 30 years old and require a substantial annual investment