

spare parts, is about 1.1 billion 1995 dollars. Buying 20 more B-2s would consume only 1 percent of the defense budget and 5 percent of the combat aircraft budget for a few years. And doing so would prevent the irreparable dispersal of the industrial base that has produced the most sophisticated weapon ever, a weapon suited to the changed world.

In 1960 there were 81 major U.S. air bases overseas. Today there are 15. The B-2's long range responds to the dwindling of forward-based U.S. forces. Its high payload and stealthiness (the difficulty of detecting its approach) enable it to do extraordinary damage to an adversary's warmaking capacity, at minimum risk to just two crew members per aircraft. This gives a president a powerful instrument of credible deterrence for an era in which Americans are increasingly reluctant to risk casualties. The importance of a military technology tailored to this political fact is argued by Edward Luttwak in his essay "Toward Post-Heroic Warfare" in *Foreign Affairs*.

Luttwak, of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, says the end of the Cold War has brought a "new season of war," in which wars are "easily started and then fought without perceptible restraint." A war such as the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait can menace the material interests of the United States. And a war such as that in the former Yugoslavia can, Luttwak argues, injure the nation's "moral economy" if the nation "remains the attentive yet passive witness of aggression replete with atrocities on the largest scale."

Perhaps Americans find their "moral economy" too taxing to maintain in today's turbulent world. The debacle of American policy regarding Bosnia strongly suggests that is so. If so, America faces a future in which only one thing is certain: it will never again be what it has been, the principal force for good in the world. But if America wants to be intolerant both of evil and of casualties, it needs to arm itself appropriately, as with the B-2.

It is the only aircraft that can on short notice go anywhere on the planet with a single refueling, penetrate the most sophisticated air defenses and deliver high payloads of conventional weapons with devastating precision. Five B-2s can deliver as many weapons as the entire force of F-117s (America's only other stealth aircraft) deployed in Desert Storm. Four U.S.-based B-2s with eight crew members could have achieved by same results as were achieved by the more than 100 aircraft sent against Libya in 1986. Military personnel are not only precious as a matter of morality, they are expensive. True, many targets can be attacked with "stand-off weapons," such as cruise missiles, but such weapons are 20 to 40 times more expensive than direct attack precision weapons. Calculating the real costs of weapons is more complicated than reading restaurant bills.

And as Luttwak argues, cost-effectiveness criteria for weapons often do not factor in the value of casualty avoidance, which is a function of casualty exposure and is often the decisive restraint on political leadership when it is considering whether to project U.S. power. "When judged very expensive, stealth planes are implicitly compared to non-stealth aircraft of equivalent range and payload, not always including the escorts that the latter also require, which increase greatly the number of fliers at risk. Missing from such calculations is any measure of the overall foreign policy value of acquiring a means of casualty-free warfare by unescorted bomber."

Will the nation need a substantial B-2 force? That depends on developments in the world, and on what America wants to be in the world. On a wall at the Jet Propulsion

Laboratory in Pasadena there reportedly use to be a sign: We do precision guesswork. So do the people who must anticipate crises relevant to America's material interests and moral economy, and the means of meeting them. Twenty more B-2s would be a responsible guess.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON]. He is a very articulate and a very strong supporter of national defense. I also thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] who was really the father of this special order. Thanks to Mr. DICKS for taking this order up.

I think it is important to talk about these things, because a lot of folks have 100 issues on their minds. They do not know what this vote is about until they actually sit down and think about it. And also the gentleman who was here earlier, Mr. LEWIS. Mr. LEWIS does not spend a lot of time talking on the House Floor. He is one of the smartest defense minds in this Congress and he is a real advocate for this program and one of our champions. I am glad he was up here discussing this with Mr. DICKS.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

□ 1630

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I will just say one final thing. One of the other articles General Skantze wrote, one of the big problems has been, ever since the Air Force reorganized and got rid of the Strategic Air Command, there really has not been an advocate for bombers inside the Air Force. They will advocate for the F-22 and the C-17, but nobody stands up for bombers, and I think that is one of the things where the Congress may have to step in. We may have to reconsider that decision and recreate a Strategic Air Command within the Air Force so we have some real attention by the service on this subject. I think we ought to consider that.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1802

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 201 and rule

XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2099.

□ 1803

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, title V was open for amendment at any point.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENSIGN

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENSIGN: Page 87, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 519. The amount otherwise provided in title I of this Act for "DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS—VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—MEDICAL CARE", the amount otherwise provided in title III of this Act for "NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT", and the amount otherwise provided in title III of this Act for "NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES" are, respectively, increased to a total of \$16,961,000,000, reduced by \$89,500,000, and reduced by \$235,000,000.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for a time limitation of 15 minutes total split equally between the two sides on the Ensign amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] will be recognized for 7½ minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment to ensure that we keep the promises made to our veterans. The Ensign amendment is about the contract with those who have served our Nation honorably without fundamentally altering the priorities set forth in the bill before us today.

First, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. LEWIS, for making tough choices. In most instances, the VA/HUD subcommittee has accommodated or exceeded the President's requested funding levels in veterans programs such as compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits, and extended care facility grants.

H.R. 2099 recognizes the invaluable contribution veterans have made to our national security, and in turn, extends security to those in time of need.

Although I appreciate the fact that this measure meets or exceeds the President's request in several accounts, I must respectfully take issue with the funding level included in H.R. 2099 for the Veterans Health Administration's medical care account. Even though the bill contains a \$499 million increase in VA medical care over last year's level, the President requested a higher level of \$16.96 billion in fiscal year 1996 for veterans medical care. The higher level is needed to provide high quality health care services to all veterans expected to seek care in 1996.

Even with the adoption of the manager's amendment, a \$184 million gap still exists between the President's VA health care request and the recommended appropriation of \$16.77 billion. I am concerned that this disparity will deprive veterans of the care that they so desperately need.

My amendment would close the \$184 million veterans medical care gap and still provide approximately \$2 million in savings which could be used for deficit reduction. The Ensign amendment would reduce the National Science Foundation's research and related activities account by \$235 million. In H.R. 2099, the research and related activities account was cut by only \$26 million from the fiscal year 1995 level. I find it hard to believe that there was only room for a \$26 million cut in a \$2.25 billion account. Even an additional \$235 million cut represents slightly more than a 10-percent reduction in this account's fiscal year 1996 appropriation.

Surely, when veterans are facing the prospect of losing access to health care, the NSF can take a 10-percent cut. I personally support NSF and the projects it supports in Nevada. However, NSF should be treated fairly, and I believe my amendment allows NSF to continue its vital research.

To complete the offset, my amendment would reduce the appropriation for NASA's human space flight account by \$89.5 million. Again, we are talking about a very small reduction in NASA's \$13.67 billion allotment. We have heard arguments from both sides about the space station and whether or not we can afford the space station in a time of great fiscal restraint. My amendment unlike other amendments, will not decimate the space station program. No specific human space flight program or initiative is targeted in my amendment. \$89.5 million is a modest cut and represents reasonable middle ground.

Between the offsets from the NSF and NASA, we can meet the President's request for health care and still provide resources for scientific research and exploration.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to focus for a moment on the skyrocketing costs of health care. We are about to reform Medicare, and I would be the

first one to rise in support of reforming our complete veterans' health care program. But until we do that, we need to completely fund our veterans' health care program. My amendment brings the funding level up to the President's requested level for fiscal year 1996. I urge its support.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California, chairman of the subcommittee, rise in opposition?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 7½ minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the Ensign amendment. I do so specifically because of the fact that this subcommittee report is a very carefully crafted and delicately balanced report.

The very account that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] is addressing himself to is that account that we are most sensitive about. It is the only account within my entire bill that has any significant adjustment upwards. Indeed, we provide in the medical care section of this bill more than a half a billion dollars of the 1995 authorization as well as outlay. It is very, very important that we recognize that to imbalance this effort could throw the entire bill askew.

For example, NSF has already been cut by \$200 million. They are considerably below the President's request. This additional \$235 million in fundamental science work would have a dramatic and negative impact upon the work that the bill is attempting to carry forward.

In dealing with NASA, NASA is already itself over a half a billion dollars below the President's request. To strike that blow to our work in space is a very significant item.

One of the other elements I would mention is the fact that we are attempting to put some pressure on the Veterans' Administration, specifically because while we here in Congress are very empathetic to medical care needs of our veterans. Too often the system treats them like cattle in the districts where the hospitals are. We need to put pressure on this agency to rethink the processes they use whereby we deliver those services to veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly but very strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

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

Mr. Chairman, while the remarks that the subcommittee chairman said are true, that it is important to have basic science research, it is important to have the programs that NSF supports and that NASA supports, it is

also true that it is critical that we maintain the contract that we have with the veterans in this country.

The reason that we have the freedoms to have basic science research in this country is because of the sacrifices that our veterans have made serving this country. I have 114,000 veterans in southern Nevada just in my district alone. Many of those veterans have to travel 4½ hours to southern California because there is not adequate funding levels at the hospital in Las Vegas to take care of their basic needs. Therefore, they have to travel all the way to southern California. I think this is a travesty to those people who have sacrificed so much, have had very little pay while they are in the service, spent a lot of time away from their families, a lot of them sacrificed limbs, a lot of them sacrificed a lot of their friends, people that they knew in battle, and to me and to a lot of the Members of this Congress, I think it is important that we maintain the contract that we have had with these veterans over the years.

I would strongly urge that Members consider supporting this amendment to bring the funding levels for 1996 up to what the President has proposed.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This is a case where you take the account that has been increased the furthest in the entire budget and then you hammer two accounts that have not taken significant increases. In particular I am very concerned about the fact that the National Science Foundation has been targeted by the gentleman from Nevada for increased cuts. This will amount to a 17 percent cut in the National Science Foundation and that is in the basic science accounts. This is where we do our basic research. This is the university money that is required in order to make certain that our university research programs stay alive.

Who are some of those universities? Well, the University and Community College System of Las Vegas got \$1.6 million. The University of Nevada at Las Vegas got over \$1 million in 1994. The Clark County School District got \$867,000. The University of Nevada Desert Research Program got \$1.731 million out of the National Science Foundation. On it goes, in programs that from everything I have been able to determine are high-quality research programs that are very, very important to the basic underlying fundamental science of this country.

□ 1815

And so, to devastate those accounts by taking them down by hundreds of millions of dollars in order to fund an account that we have already increased

significantly, it seems to me, is the wrong set of priorities.

I understand that the gentleman wants to keep our commitments, but we have commitments that are very, very important in science. There are many of these science researchers that over the years also feel that they have a commitment to making certain that we keep this Nation economically strong by having a good basic science base. This particular amendment will cut into that basic science base; this is one of the worst places that we can possibly find to cut programs in the entire VA-HUD budget.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DOYLE], a member of the committee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I do so with a unique perspective on this matter, as I am the only member of this body who sits on both of the authorizing Committees affected by this amendment.

I am honored to represent a district with one of the largest veterans populations, and I am extremely sensitive to the need to adequately fund veterans' health care. My father was a permanently disabled veteran. I could not imagine what my life would be like if he had not had access to quality VA health care.

It would be my preference to fully fund the administration's request for VA health care, which the amendment before us would do by cutting \$235 million from NSF's research account to achieve \$100 million in savings, coupled with a \$89.5 million in NASA funds. Despite my support for our nation's veterans, I cannot support this amendment because of its impact on the National Science Foundation.

In the Science Committee, we have gone to great pains, under the leadership of Chairman WALKER, to make the difficult decisions on funding priorities in order to achieve a balanced budget. I must tell the author of this amendment, since he wasn't present for the seven or so days that the Science Committee spent considering all the programs in its jurisdiction, that no federal agency enjoyed a greater degree of bipartisan support than the National Science Foundation.

We are already cutting this account by \$26 million from FY 95, and NSF as a whole is being cut by over \$200 million from the current year. I am not sure why NSF has been targeted by this amendment, but I cannot endorse this effort to support one worthwhile effort by cutting a greater amount of funds from another important program.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, although the reasons of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] are worthwhile, I have to oppose this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague,

the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], ranking member of the Committee on Science.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a battle that we have gone through many times before over the past years, and I have frequently sided with those who support the position of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] with regard to taking money from NASA or other science agencies and adding it to veterans, because I have such a feeling for the needs of the veterans.

But in this particular case, I spent most of the last week arguing that we had cut NASA too much already, over half a billion dollars, and voted against the space station because of those cuts that came out of NASA science, basically.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to oppose the amendment before us for that reason. I think that we have achieved a good balance, not at the level that I would want, but within the constraints of the money available; a good balance with the bill that we have.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to support the numbers which are contained in the bill presented to us by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. ENSIGN. The amendment makes cuts to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation that are ill-advised and will do serious damage if enacted.

Let us first consider the NASA cut. NASA's request for fiscal year 1996 has already been cut by \$600 million in this appropriations bill. In addition, NASA's funding plans have been cut by 35 percent since 1993. The proposed amendment would cut an additional \$90 million from NASA's human space flight account. Now, \$90 million does not sound like a great deal of money in a \$5 billion account, but in this case appearances are seriously deceiving.

NASA's human space flight account provides funding for the space station and the space shuttle. The station program was restructured in 1993, its overall development budget was cut by billions of dollars, and annual funding for the program was capped at \$2.1 billion. There is no room for additional cuts to the space station budget if the international space station is to meet its demanding schedule commitments.

The budget for space shuttle operations has been cut 23 percent since fiscal year 1992, and the President's fiscal year 1996 budget assumes that additional cuts will be made to the shuttle program during the period fiscal year 1997–2000. NASA is making plans to restructure the shuttle program to further reduce costs through contract consolidations and other management changes. However, the shuttle account cannot absorb additional cuts in fiscal year 1996 without running an unacceptable risk that the shuttle will not be able to carry out its missions, and that NASA will

not be able to make needed safety and performance upgrades.

I cannot stress too strongly how important it is not to impose additional budgetary stress on the space shuttle program at a time when the shuttle program is trying to adjust to the cuts already imposed on it. I do not think that I need to remind any Member that the shuttle is a very complicated machine. Indeed, this weekend's decision to defer further shuttle flights until NASA understands the current problem with the shuttle O-rings underlines the importance of proceeding with caution when dealing with the shuttle program.

Turning to the National Science Foundation, this amendment would cut \$235 million from NSF's research and related activities account. This account is already below the fiscal year 1995 funding level in the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee. The additional proposed cut of 11.4 percent will harm basic research in many important fields of science.

Although NSF is a small agency with only about 4 percent of all Federal R&D funding, it is the only Federal agency mandated to strengthen the Nation's overall potential in science and engineering. Moreover, the Agency is a principal source of Federal support for basic research in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering: 60% of computer science support; 44% of mathematics support; 34% of biological sciences support; 33% of earth sciences support; and 19% of engineering support.

A cut of \$235 million translates into foregoing potential advances in knowledge in such fields as advanced computers and high-speed digital networks, electronic and structural materials, biotechnology, and nanoscience—the observation and manipulation of chemical, biological, and mechanical processes at the atomic scale.

The cut will also help to weaken the scientific infrastructure of universities. Last year, well over 20,000 senior scientists and 18,500 graduate students worked on research projects sponsored by NSF, mostly at colleges and universities. The proposed cut to NSF's research account would reduce these numbers by 2,100 scientists and 1,900 graduate students. In addition, 24 percent of the research and related activities budget supports unique national research facilities, such as telescopes, research ships, and supercomputers, all of which enable a broad range of research activities. Imposition of a \$235 million cut to the research account will mean that operations are reduced and maintenance delayed for these facilities.

Reductions in basic research budgets have consequences for the economic strength of the Nation and the future well being of its citizens. Federal support for basic research is an investment, as has been quantified by economists who find a social rate of return from basic research funding of 30 to 50 percent. The proposed cut to the NSF research budget is shortsighted.

I urge my colleagues to resist the temptation to make additional cuts to NASA and NSF.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] on the outstanding job that he has done with a difficult bill.

This amendment highlights the problems that he has had with this bill. There are conflicting interests, all of which are necessary and vital. We pit NASA against housing; housing against veterans' benefits. There is no one in this Chamber that wants to cut any of these things unless it is absolutely necessary. And it is absolutely necessary to cut these to get to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The gentleman's amendment is well intentioned, but it still cuts \$89.5 million out of NASA, and \$235 million out of the National Science Foundation. These cuts are proposed in an effort to help the veterans' programs which now currently, in this bill, receive \$562 million in medical benefits over and above what we spent last year. That represents a total of \$16.777 billion in medical care for veterans.

Mr. Chairman, nobody can say that that is not sufficient. We can always spend more money on these programs, but I would hope that the Members would understand that we cannot continue to spend more money on every good cause. We have got to try to balance the competing interests.

Mr. Chairman, this is a balanced bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the members of the Committee on Appropriations have tried to bring forward a balanced bill considering all of the needs: The needs of the veterans, the needs of science, the needs of NASA, and the needs of housing. Together, those needs demand that this amendment be rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, while I respect the words that have been said by my colleagues and respect the work that has gone into making this bill, I still think that this is a question of priorities, and the priorities that I have remain with the veterans in this country.

When we are looking at limited funds, we do have to say, "What is important? How much should we spend on veterans? How much should we spend on science?"

Science is a theoretical number. Should we spend \$100 billion on those science programs? Should we spend \$200 billion? We have no idea what that number should be. It is some number floating out there.

We do know, Mr. Chairman, that veterans have those needs and we do know that we are not meeting those needs currently. To not increase this number up to what the President has requested, I think, would be doing a disservice to the veterans who have paid such a dear price in serving our country. That is why I have offered this amendment, because of the sacrifice that those veterans have made.

It is a question of priorities. There is no question.

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult decision to make, and I appreciate what the subcommittee chairman and all the members of the committee have gone through in crafting this bill. To me, though, this happens to be a question of priorities. I believe that the NSF can take a 10-percent cut in this year's budget. It is just a question of the priorities that I have set for myself to come and represent the people of southern Nevada and especially those 114,000 veterans that I represent there.

I believe they deserve the medical care that they are to get this year. I would be the first one, though, to add my voice to reforming the whole veterans' medical care. It needs to be reformed just like Medicare does. We need to provide better service for less cost, and then maybe next year, we will not have this argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 27, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] will be postponed.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WALKER] having assumed the chair, Mr. COMBEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 2099) making appropriations, for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 205 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 205

*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. 2126) making appropriations 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. All points of order against consideration of the

bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of the rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. 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. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. An amendment striking section 8021 and 8024 of the bill shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. 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 amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor yet another very fair and simple open rule. H. Res. 205 provides for one hour of general debate, equally divided between the majority and the minority. Following that, any Member can offer amendments in accordance with the rules of the House.

Members are encouraged, but not required, to preprint their amendments in the RECORD, so that we can engage in full and well-informed debate, and I think that is something that has actually worked out pretty well.

In addition, the committee granted limited waivers for the consideration of H.R. 2126, including waivers of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI regarding unauthorized appropriations and reappropriation within this bill.

The need for these protections, due to lack of the authorization for many of the programs, has been thoroughly debated, so I will not debate it here. We all know we have a problem between the authorizing and the appropriations cycle and that is part of the budget reform that we hope to bring forward.

In order to expedite the floor schedule and allow the House to complete its schedule appropriations work before the August break, which I think is of great interest to every Member and