

time for us to say here in Beijing, and the world to hear, that it is no longer acceptable to discuss women's rights as separate from human rights.

These abuses have continued because, for too long, the history of women has been a history of silence. Even today, there are those who are trying to silence our words.

The voices of this conference and of the women at Hairou must be heard loud and clear:

It is a violation of human rights when babies are denied food, or drowned, or suffocated, or their spines broken, simply because they are born girls.

It is a violation of human rights when women and girls are sold into the slavery of prostitution.

It is a violation of human rights when women are doused with gasoline, set on fire and burned to death because their marriage dowries are deemed too small.

It is a violation of human rights when individual women are raped in their own communities and when thousands of women are subjected to rape as a tactic or prize of war.

It is a violation of human rights when a leading cause of death worldwide among women ages 14 to 44 is the violence they are subjected to in their own homes.

It is a violation of human rights when young girls are brutalized by the painful and degrading practice of genital mutilation.

It is a violation of human rights when women are denied the rights to plan their own families, and that includes being forced to have abortions or being sterilized against their will.

If there is one message that echoes forth from this conference, it is that human rights are women's rights. . . . And women's rights are human rights.

Let us not forget that among those rights are the right to speak freely. And the right to be heard.

Women must enjoy the right to participate fully in the social and political lives of their countries if we want freedom and democracy to thrive and endure.

It is indefensible that many women in non-governmental organizations who wished to participate in this conference have not been able to attend—or have been prohibited from fully taking part.

Let me be clear. Freedom means the right of people to assemble, organize, and debate openly. It means respecting the views of those who may disagree with the views of their governments. It means not taking citizens away from their loved ones and jailing them, mistreating them, or denying them their freedom or dignity because of the peaceful expression of their ideas and opinions.

In my country, we recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took 150 years after the signing of our Declaration of Independence for women to win the right to vote. It took 72 years of organized struggle on the part of many courageous women and men.

It was one of America's most divisive philosophical wars. But it was also a bloodless war. Suffrage was achieved without a shot fired.

We have also been reminded, in V-J Day observances last weekend, of the good that comes when men and women join together to combat the forces of tyranny and build a better world.

We have seen peace prevail in most places for a half century. We have avoided another world war.

But we have not solved older, deeply-rooted problems that continue to diminish the potential of half the world's population.

Now it is time to act on behalf of women everywhere.

If we take bold steps to better the lives of women we will be taking bold steps to better the lives of children and families too. Families rely on mothers and wives for emotional support and care; families rely on women for labor in the home; and increasingly, families rely on women for income needed to raise healthy children and care for other relatives.

As long as discrimination and inequities remain so commonplace around the world—as long as girls and women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes—the potential of the human family to create a peaceful, prosperous world will not be realized.

Let this conference be our—and the world's—call to action.

And let us heed the call so that we can create a world in which every woman is treated with respect and dignity, every boy and girl is loved and cared for equally, and every family has the hope of a strong and stable future.

Thank you very much.

God's blessing on you, your work and all who will benefit from it.

#### THE B-2 BOMBER AND AMERICA'S READINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to address the House of Representatives in this special order on a very important issue that will come before the House tomorrow morning, tomorrow afternoon, when we consider the defense appropriations bill. Since 1980, I have been a strong supporter of the policy of former President Carter and Secretary of Defense Harold Brown in initiating the stealth bomber, the B-2 program.

In the gulf war, we saw with vivid evidence the effectiveness of stealth technology when it was decided to use the F-117's against the most heavily defended targets inside Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The F-117's, without the requirement for jammers and other support aircraft, were able to go in and attack the most heavily defended targets, using 2,000 pound precision-guided munitions. They were able to knock out those radars and surface to air missiles almost instantly, and come back without out pilots being shot down.

I believe that the B-2 bomber is just a bigger and better version of the F-117. It allows us to go five times as far and carry eight times as much conventional munitions and submunitions. With those same 2,000 pounds, it could carry 16, each of which would be independently targetable.

I think the most revolutionary thing about stealth technology is its capability against mobile targets. In a B-2 study that was done by Rand back in 1991, a simulation was used of Saddam Hussein's division, moving from Saudi Arabia into Kuwait. The B-2 was loaded up with sensor-fused weapons. Each B-2 could carry about 1,400 of these submunitions that looks like a puck with a parachute on top when dispensed. With Saddam's division coming

into Kuwait, three B-2's interdicted it, dropped the sensor-fused weapons, and were able to knock out 46 percent of the mechanized vehicles including tanks in that division. That, Mr. Speaker, is a revolutionary conventional capability.

The problem is that every study that has been done on the B-2 indicates that having only 16 of them is simply not enough. The Rand study and the study that was done by Gen. Jasper Welch, stated that somewhere between 40 and 60 are needed. I in fact asked General Powell what he recommended to Dick Cheney, and he said, "I recommended 50."

In my judgment, this is the most important defense decision we will be making in this decade. Seven former Secretaries of Defense wrote President Clinton urging him to procure additional B-2's. We have spent \$44.4 billion to develop the technology for the B-2 bomber. We are now able to get an additional 20 B-2's for about \$15.3 billion. In my mind, that is affordable. If we shut down the line, and if we come back to it in 5 or 10 years and say, "My gosh, we do not have the bombers we need for the future," it will cost \$10 billion just to open the line and we get nothing.

My judgment is that there is another important issue that has been missed by the press. That is the cost of the munitions on these planes. If we have standoff weapons, which the administration supports, on the B-52's and the B-1-B's, first of all, they have no utility against mobile targets. No. 2, is that they cost \$1.2 million per missile, because you have to have long-range missiles. They also cost about \$15 to \$20 billion for a load of them.

The cost of the weapons in the B-2 J-DAMS weapon is \$320,000 for 16 of them, and in my judgment, that is a major difference, one-fourth the cost of one cruise missile and a fraction of the cost of a load of missiles. In a few days of a major conflict, you could pay for the B-2 simply by having these less expensive weapons, either the sensor-fused weapon or the J-DAMS. I think that is a major difference. I also believe, if we had enough B-2's, the potential someday for a conventional deterrent.

What if we had been able to show Saddam that we had this capability and we could have avoided the gulf war? It cost us \$10 billion to move all our forces out to the gulf. Then it cost \$60 billion to prosecute the war, \$70 billion was expended.

□ 1330

The cold war is over, yet we still have threats out there. People say there are no threats. Saddam still exists. We have problems with Iran, we have problems with North Korea. And in each of those scenarios, there could be military divisions coming across the borders into a neighboring country.

In my judgment, having this long-range stealth bomber capability that can go in without any other support

aircraft with it, being able to attack mobile targets and also go after Scud launchers, that is a new capability that only the B-2 would have. To me this kind of revolutionary conventional capability is exactly what the country needs.

So I hope my colleagues tomorrow will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to take out the money for the B-2. I believe that this Stealth bomber is exactly what we need for the future, and I urge my colleagues to continue to support this important weapons system as we did on the defense authorization bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. THURMAN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. LOFGREN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LEWIS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 4 p.m.

□ 1600

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 4 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of making an announcement.

The Rules Committee is planning to meet tomorrow, September 7, to report a rule for the consideration of H.R.

1655, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

The chairman of the Intelligence Committee has requested a rule which would require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If this request is granted, and I believe it will be, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted at the Speaker's table.

The amendments would still need to be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Rules Committee or to testify as long as the amendments comply with the House rules.

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 206

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forth the first of the 13 appropriations bills that has made it through the conference process. This rule is very simple—it merely waives points of order against the consideration of the conference report. Specifically, the rule contains waivers for three items that go beyond the scope of the conference, thereby waiving clause 3 of rule XXVIII. There are also a few legislative

items which necessitate a waiver of clause 2 of rule XX.

There was very little discussion at the hearing to grant the rule and I do not believe there should be much controversy surrounding it.

Before the district work period, I read press accounts that the President may be considering a veto of this conference report, not because he disagrees with any of its substance, but rather because it is the first of the necessary 13 spending measures to reach his desk, and he may, apparently, wish to protest against some other bills that he does not have substantive objections to.

I think that action by the President would be very unfortunate—but we need to proceed with the responsibilities that we have, like passing the appropriations bills. And with this bill we are setting the example of moving toward a balanced budget by reducing our own budget first. As a Member of Congress who serves on both of the Speaker-appointed committees, and in my role on the Committee on House Oversight, I am very proud of the reforms achieved in H.R. 1854 and retained in this conference report, based on the recommendations by House Oversight. We had some tough choices to make, but getting our own House in order and cutting our own budget was a necessary and important first step in the long and difficult road toward achieving a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall from the House's consideration of this bill in June, H.R. 1854 incorporates House Oversight plans to greatly reform the internal workings of the House of Representatives, and over the next few months alone, save the taxpayers \$7 million by streamlining operations. This bill is below the subcommittee's 602(B) allocation and is over 8 percent below last year's spending level. Additionally, H.R. 1854 eliminates, consolidates and reduces, and paves the way for the privatization of some functions that may be less costly when performed by the private sector.

I would like to commend Chairman THOMAS, Chairman PACKARD, Ranking Member FAZIO and of course Chairman LIVINGSTON, for their excellent work in bringing this conference report forward.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 206 is necessary to preserve the agreements reached in conference on legislative branch appropriations I urge adoption of both the rule and the conference report.

#### RULE FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT SPECIFIC WAIVERS INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL WAIVER

##### ITEMS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF CONFERENCE (CLAUSE 3, RULE XXVIII)

Amendment #10 adds new features to the Senate proposal for 60 days of severance pay for employees of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), such as entitlement to health benefits. The House had no comparable provision.

Amendment #34 includes a provision directing the Public Printer to propose a