

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2126,
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AP-
PROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule 232, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2126), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 25, 1995, at page H9453.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire, I understand the normal procedure is to have the time split 50-50 between the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]. Is my understanding correct that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in support of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania support the conference report?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, then I ask that the time be divided three ways and I be allocated the customary 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2126, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we bring back a good conference report today. It is a bipartisan conference report providing for the national defense of our national readiness today, midterm and longterm. The total of the bill is \$243.3 billion. That is \$1.7 billion more than fiscal year 1995, but it is \$746 million less than the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, we had a very difficult conference. We had over 1,700 items in disagreement with the other body. Those complications were further complicated by a further reduction in our 602(b) allocation during the conference of \$858 million.

We were able to work out all of the issues. It required some compromise on

both sides; compromise that maybe at times was not exactly pleasant to all of us, but we managed to work out those issues and I want to thank the people that served on the subcommittee as conferees and the members of the staff for the tremendous work that was done.

Mr. Speaker, I speak to the Members on my side of the Chamber. One of the major cornerstones of our Contract With America was to revitalize our national defense, to make a change in the 11-year reduction in providing for our national defense. This bill does that.

This bill is a basic part of our Contract With America. This keeps faith with our troops. We provide quality-of-life funding in this bill above the President's budget request, such as housing allowances, and we add additional money for barracks renovation. Some of the barracks in our military were so poor, we would be ashamed to see them. We are making additional money available to correct this.

Mr. Speaker, this bill emphasizes readiness and adds over \$170 million for training shortfalls that developed because of unplanned contingencies. We add \$647 million for unfunded operations that are going on in Iraq today. This is the first time we have been up front with the taxpayer and up front with our colleagues saying we will pay for these contingency operations as they go, rather than waiting for an emergency supplemental later on.

Outside of our scope, we added \$300 million for the Coast Guard. The breast cancer provisions and funding that this House took was included in the conference report. No change.

Modernization; we were strong on modernization, not only for today but for mid-term and long-term readiness. During the hearings, we identified many, many items of shortages that were not in the budget request because they did not have a lot of political appeal. They did not really appeal to the media.

We provided money for replacing some things that were broken and to repair some things that needed to be repaired. In addition, we have a robust program for our F-15's, F-16's, F-18's and the AV-8B.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I am going to reserve the balance of my time. There are many other things we can discuss that are in the bill. It is a good bill and it deserves the support of the Members today.

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

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the House the conference report on the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, H.R. 2126.

This conference agreement: Totals \$243.3 billion in new budget authority; it begins a revitalization of America's Armed Forces; it enhances the quality of life of our troops who have been deployed to distant lands so frequently in recent years; and it aggressively addresses current and projected modernization shortfalls.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote is the culmination of a 9-month-long legislative process which we began in January with hearings on the high tempo of operations and the frequency of unbudgeted contingency operations.

Throughout the hearing process this year, we focused on the issue of "the serious shortfalls that exist in the areas of equipment, training, maintenance, and quality of life." The original House bill included funds to at least partially take care of these shortfalls. I am pleased to report that the Senate agreed with us on many of those House initiatives and thus this bill makes an important contribution to overcoming these shortfalls.

The media coverage of this bill has focused on big ticket items such as the B-2. I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that a significant portion of the initiatives taken in the conference agreement is for unglamorous but essential items such as trucks, ammunition, and communications gear.

For example, during hearings on the C-17 aircraft we found that the off-load/on-load equipment for air transport aircraft was up to 23 years old and breaking down about every 10 hours. We added money to address that problem. I could give many other examples.

CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker, it was a long and arduous but highly productive conference. When the conference began we had over 1,700 items in disagreement. In the spirit of compromise there were a few instances where the House had to meet the other body half way on issues which the House felt very strongly about. However, difficult decisions must be made to produce an end product.

Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement provides an increase of \$6.9 billion above the budget request. But let me put that in perspective.

The procurement account requested in budget was at the lowest level in 45 years when measured in constant dollars.

Statistical and anecdotal evidence indicated that morale and readiness has been declining.

A year ago, three Army divisions declined to a C-3 readiness level, which means they had decreased flexibility, increased vulnerability, and required significant resources to offset deficiencies.

Defense manpower has declined by over 1.2 million personnel for the Active Forces, Guard and Reserve, and civilians employed by the Department since 1987.

We held innumerable hearings over many months to determine what was the appropriate funding level and program mix to reverse this steady erosion. I believe the results speak for themselves and we have produced an excellent bill.

The conferees had three main objectives in this legislation:

First, ensure that our forces remain the best fighting force in the world.

Second, proceed with a modernization program that addresses current shortfalls and provides for future security needs.

Third, ensure that we get the optimal return for the Defense expenditures by eliminating programs of marginal military value and reducing or reforming other programs which have encountered technical problems.

This legislation attains those objectives. The funding provided in this bill fulfills the constitutional obligation of the Congress to "provide for the common defense."

SUMMARY OF AGREEMENT

The conference report explains in detail the recommendations of the conferees. I will briefly highlight some of the major initiatives included in this bill:

Quality of life: We took a number of steps to enhance the quality of life of our troops. For example, we added \$322,000,000 for renovation of barracks. We approved the pay raise and increased military housing allowances for high-cost areas.

Readiness: We have been very concerned about the decline in readiness of various units. In addition to the 3 Army divisions I mentioned earlier, it should be noted that in September of 1994, 8 Marine Corps aviation squadrons were grounded for the entire month, and 28 Marine and Navy squadrons had to ground over one-half of their aircraft. There has been an enormous increase in the backlog for real property maintenance and depot maintenance. We provided an increase of \$307,000,000 for depot maintenance and \$378,000,000 for real property maintenance at operational facilities. Funds were also added for specialized skill military training.

One of the major and most important initiatives in this bill is an add-on of \$647 million above the budget for the ongoing operations in and around Iraq—for example, operations provide comfort and southern watch. Despite the fact that these operations are entering their fourth year, they have never been budgeted for by the administration. The addition of these funds ensures that other operating accounts will not be raided to fund these ongoing operations.

Modernization: The budget request for procurement for fiscal year 1996 was \$39.4 billion. This is a decline of \$96.8 billion, I repeat \$96.8 billion, from fiscal year 1985 when measured in constant dollars. The budget requested no funds to procure tanks, Air Force fighter aircraft, reconnaissance helicopters, attack helicopters, or fighting vehicles. production rates of numerous other systems are at historically low rates. For example, for the first time since the Air Force became a separate service, the budget request contained no request for tactical fighter aircraft. The research, development, test and evaluation account has also been decreasing and many key programs in research have been undergoing slippage.

To reverse this steady erosion of modernization and the industrial base, the conference agreement took a number of important steps.

In terms of major systems, funds were added to continue the production of the B-2 bomber and to build a new amphibious ship and an amphibious transport ship. We added \$100 million for acceleration of the Comanche helicopter. Programs funded at the budget request include the V-22 Osprey aircraft, and the C-17 air transport aircraft. Increases were included for the Navy's F/A-18 E/F aircraft and the Air Force's F-15E and F-16 tactical aircraft. We added \$777 million for procurement of equipment for the Guard and Reserve.

Missile Defense: The conference agreement includes a net increase of \$529 million for the ballistic missile defense programs [BMD]. The total provided for this essential program is \$3.44 billion. This expanded program accelerates both the Theater Missile Defense Program and the National Missile Defense Program, thus increasing the protection of our

troops deployed abroad as well as in the United States.

REDUCED LOWER PRIORITY PROGRAMS

The conferees made substantial reductions in programs which are of lower military value as outlined in the following table:

Table with 3 columns: Program, Reduction, and Amount. Rows include Technology Reinvestment Program (\$305,000,000), Energy management programs (184,600,000), Defense acquisition/management studies (164,000,000), and Consultants/studies and analysis (20,700,000).

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, in summary I would like to point out that this conference agreement totals \$243.3 billion.

It has been a bipartisan effort in the subcommittee markup, full committee markup, and passage on the floor.

The full House has voted four times this year to support Defense funding levels above those recommended for Defense in this bill: (1) National security authorization bill; (2) national security appropriations bill; (3) House budget resolution; and (4) conference agreement on the budget resolution.

The total is within the 602(b) allocation for Defense.

This conference agreement: Enhances readiness; enhances the quality of life for our troops; deletes and or reduces funding for lower priority programs; and includes a modernization program which helps to meet the future security needs of America.

I urge support for the fiscal year 1996 Defense conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert for the RECORD a list that summarizes typographical errors in House Report 104-261, the statement of managers, accompanying this conference report. These corrections reflect agreements reached by the conferees and should be treated as such by the Department of Defense.

TYPOGRAPHICAL CORRECTIONS TO HOUSE REPORT 104-261

Table for Page Number 52. Reads: Total Military Personnel, Air Force +186,500 +48,323 +99,323. Should Read: Total Military Personnel, Air Force +186,500 +48,323 +99,623.

Table for Page Number 90. Reads: B-1B 75,393 82,593 76,283 58,483. Should Read: B-1B 75,393 82,593 76,283 68,483.

Table for Page Number 90. Reads: Last 4 lines of the table for Procurement, Marine Corps Reads: F-15 Post Production Support 13,955 13,955 6,978. F-16 Post Production Support 194,672 94,672 158,572 126,622. Other Production Charges 167,676 167,676 188,576 187,676. DARP Support Equipment 194,374 194,374 214,374 194,374.

Should be deleted from Marine Corps table and included at the end of Aircraft Procurement, Air Force table which starts at the bottom of Page 90.

Table for Page Number 97. Reads: C-26 for the Air National Guard (2) 11,000,000. Should Read: C-26 for the National Guard (2) 11,000,000.

Table for Page Number 98. Reads: Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard: Information Management 29,396 59,456 44,596. Should Read: Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard: Information Management 29,396 59,456 44,556. Reads: Other Procurement, Army RCAS 113,134 83,174 108,174. Should Read: Other Procurement, Army RCAS 113,134 83,174 83,174.

Table for Page 102. Reads: Missile Technology 17,985 17,985 12,740 17,965. Should Read: Missile Technology 17,985 17,985 12,740 17,985.

Table for Page 104. Reads: Medical Advanced Technology Breat Cancer. Should Read: Breast Cancer. Reads: [. . . no later than January 15, 1995]. Should Read: [. . . no later than January 15, 1996].

Table for Page 107. Reads: Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology 51,816 51,816 45,170 48,483. Should Read: Undersea Warfare Advanced Technology 51,816 51,816 45,170 48,493.

Table for Page 109. Reads: ASW and Other Helicopter Development AH-1W -11,628 -11,628 Should Read: ASW and Other Helicopter Development AH-1W -11,628 -11,628 -11,628.

Table for Page 117. Reads: Strategic Environmental Research Program 58,435 58,155 58,435 58,156. Should Read: Strategic Environmental Research Program 58,435 58,155 58,435 58,155.

Table for Page 120. Reads: Joint Advanced Strike Technology Dem/Val 30,675 30,675 18,775 30,678. Should Read: Joint Advanced Strike Technology Dem/Val 30,675 30,675 18,775 30,675.

Table for Page 120. Reads: Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program Maneuver UAV 36,800 16,800 36,800 28,800. Should Read: Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program Maneuver UAV 36,800 16,800 36,800 26,800.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for working his way through a very, very difficult bill. As the gentleman mentioned, we had 1,700 areas of disagreement. Some of the major areas of disagreement were with the White House and others with the Senate.

In some, the Senate agreed with the White House, and it put us in a difficult position where we were not able to come to an agreement which satisfied everybody. Any time we have a conference report, it is obviously a compromise between all the parties.

One of the areas of particular disagreement was Bosnia. All of us have a concern about Bosnia. There is not one who has been more involved in trying to force White Houses, whether Republican or Democrat, to ask for authorization before we send peacekeeping forces to any foreign nation.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and I have been working for the last year, with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the overall committee, in trying to convince the White House that if they send peacekeepers into Bosnia, and I support them in sending forces to extract any U.N. forces who are there now if they got into trouble. I think the United States has a legitimate commitment there. I think we have a legitimate commitment on the bombing. But the peacekeeping is a different situation.

One of the most difficult tasks we can ask of our military is peacekeeping, because the way the military protects American lives is to use overwhelming force. That means in many cases we have to kill people, and we, then, become the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have gotten to the point, after 3 years of negotiation, that this administration has committed themselves to ask for authorization before we send peacekeepers into Bosnia.

□ 1245

Now, this is an important point. There are a number of people who want to vote against the conference. At this very time, we have a meeting going on at the White House where they are laying out their plans and consulting with Congress about what needs to be done in Bosnia. At the very least, the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State have both committed themselves publicly to urge the White House to come to the Congress before they commit any troops for peacekeeping in Bosnia. I think that is the way it should be. I think, not only from the process of authorization and appropriation, it is important for the support of the American people.

So we moved in that direction, and so we took the language out of our bill. The Senate said it will not want the language. It would not accept it. The White House felt we went too far. All of us understand the prerogative of the White House when it comes to dealing with national security.

I do not feel that humanitarian deployments are national security. So we think we have finally convinced this White House that, before they make this particular deployment, they are going to come to the Congress and ask for authorization. I would not be sur-

prised that as of this very time they have mentioned this to the Members of Congress who are at the meeting in the White House.

The other issues that we worked our way through, we always find areas where we have to increase the budget, decrease the budget. There are some talks about procurement being increased and readiness or O&M being decreased. The problem here is that in many cases, if we do not upgrade our equipment, we are going to run into a terrible problem in readiness. For instance, the Navy got behind the procurement of airplanes. So all the airplanes they have are slow or outdated and/or they are not stealthy. This is because they did not buy or upgrade their equipment.

So it is important, as important as individual readiness is for troops. We run into even a greater problem if we do not have technological superiority of a weapons system.

I say this is as good a bill as we can come up with, compromising with what we knew the White House rejected and what the White House did not agree to, even though I have a message here which I got 2 minutes ago which says this bill is not acceptable. I hope that if this bill passes the House, we will be able to convince the White House that they should sign the bill.

I have assurances from the Chief of Staff that he will consider it. The chairman of the committee and I both have talked to them. Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE believe that we can convince the White House at some point.

They would like to see this bill delayed, but I see no point in delaying it, since the Senate is going to delay their sending the bill down to the White House. So we worked our way through a very difficult situation, and we think we have presented as good a bill as we can present.

All of us disagree with elements in this bill. All of us would like to see some changes, but, frankly, this is as good as we could do, given the constraints we were working under in the conference itself.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Pennsylvania are both strongly in support of this bill. They care very deeply about the defense posture of the United States and they know a lot about it, and I respect that. I respect their commitment to this bill, even though I happen to disagree with them.

But I have to say that I think this bill ought to go down in its present form. I do not enjoy saying that. But the fact is this bill is \$7 billion above the President's budget request. The main problem is that this bill cannot possibly result in a defense budget which will live within the budget lim-

its established by the Kasich budget, which just passed this House just a few months ago. One of the best kept secrets in this town is that, while the defense bill this year spends more money than President Clinton wants to spend, in the outyears, the Kasich budget resolution calls for a lower defense number than the President's own budget provides. Yet, this bill is so loaded up with procurement items that it cannot possibly live below that ceiling in the outyears, if we do not make some major adjustments now.

Just as a smattering of items, for instance, this bill has moved a good deal of money out of readiness and into procurement, including unnecessary purchases for B-2's, \$500 million above the President's budget on star wars. We have additional C-130's. We have a number of ships that the President did not ask for, and we have got the beginning of a huge new buy for the F-22. We simply cannot afford to buy all of those things if we are going to stay within the budget ceiling that the Kasich budget resolution establishes.

I would like to focus the remainder of my remarks on the motion to recommit, which I expect to offer at the end of this debate today. The taxpayers in my State, and I think around the country, are outraged by reports that over the last several months the bosses in the Pentagon have gotten together with the bosses the defense industry to cook up a scheme to stick the taxpayers with a huge bill for corporate welfare.

The Pentagon has agreed to pay millions of tax dollars to 460 executives affected by the merger of two defense contractors, Lockheed and Martin Marietta. That reported plan is to hold up the taxpayers for \$31 million out of a \$92 million golden parachute deal. In fact, one of the gentlemen involved, one of the gentleman who will receive those nice benefits will receive over \$8 million, a good portion of that right out of the pockets of the taxpayer.

In the meantime, Lockheed/Martin expects to fire a total of 30,000 workers over 18 months. Where are their good-bye Christmas presents in comparison to what is happening to these executives? Under our system, if these private corporations choose to waste their private funds in this fashion, I guess it is all right with me, although I question it; but I certainly do not see why the taxpayers ought to have to pay one-third of the deal.

I think it is especially ironic that some of the same budgeteers who would have us gut programs to educate our kids, to take care of our senior citizens, to retrain the very workers who are being fired in these mergers, they do not even bat an eye when their corporate friends cook up these cozy deals for their multi-million-dollar handout.

Now, what happened is that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] offered language in the House floor which tried to fix the problem. The

committee accepted that language. But then the legal beagles down at the Pentagon sent us a note telling us that they had found a way to get around it. They will try to find a way to get around virtually everything we send them. But my motion to recommit will, if adopted by the House, fix the problem so that they cannot get around it. It will see to it that, if they want to provide those golden parachutes for those executives, they do it out of their own profits, that they do not do it out of the deficit-laden budget of the United States at the expense of the taxpayers.

There should not be this \$31 million giveaway in this bill. So I would urge, when the time comes, that Members vote for the motion to recommit. I would urge that Members vote against the conference report because this bill does not live up to the fiscal promises made just 4 months ago in this House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I will say, I disagree with the gentleman who just spoke. This does live up to the budgetary agreements that this House agreed to earlier this year. As a matter of fact, we are below those numbers.

On the issue of the motion to recommit that the gentleman mentioned, we supported the Sanders language in the conference not only the language but the intent. In the conference, I thought it was only fair to tell the members of the conference committee of the memorandum from the Pentagon. At the time I made the point, I did not believe that it was a legal opinion, that it was merely an opinion from someone in the Pentagon. But we support the Sanders language. We are prepared to establish by colloquy the intent of the Sanders language. But I do not think that is a good reason to recommit this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], a very distinguished member of the subcommittee and of the conference committee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking member, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], our fine chairman, for I do not think there are any two Members that are more committed and focused to getting a job done. When we have 1700 disagreements in conference and can work through those in a matter of 3 or 4 days, that is highly commendable.

This bill ensures our military men and women will remain ready, prepared and second to none on this planet.

I would strongly urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote for this very important bill. Unfortunately, the fog of misinformation has obscured the benefits of this bill and led some to consider opposing it. Let me lift the fog and make clear what is fact and what is fiction.

It has been alleged that this bill provides for taxpayer funding of abortions.

That is not true. That is not true. The fact is that taxpayer dollars do not pay for abortions at DOD facilities. The fact is the bill reaffirms the role of authorizing committees in determining policy and prohibits abortions at DOD facilities if the authorizing committees endorse that action.

Folks, if we care about a person's right to life, we will care about the lives of our fighting men and women stationed all over the world because we will care about the weapons and the training and all of the things that are provided for in this bill that helps our people stay alive in military installations around this world.

It has been alleged that this bill provides a green light for American military intervention in Bosnia. Once again, not true. Congress will vote on any deployment of our military and voting against this bill will only ensure that if Americans come under fire they may not be prepared and they may in fact be at risk. These are the facts.

It has been alleged that this bill contains pork barrel projects. This is also not true. Members may argue with some of the policy choices made in this bill, but these choices are not pork. This bill contains funding to ensure America's military remains second to none. Every dollar in this bill can be justified by military need. Although some may disagree on the need for a strong military, that is a policy disagreement, not an issue of pork barrel spending.

These are the facts, let us put aside arguments based on fiction. The facts are simple. The Federal Government has one obligation for which it is solely responsible, defending the shores and territory of the United States and opposing our enemies on foreign soil. As elected representatives, our primary responsibility must always be our Nation's security. A no vote against this bill abdicates the responsibility and fails the American people. That is a fact. Any other view is fiction.

Our decision should be simple, support the facts, ensure a secure America, vote yes and in support of the defense appropriations bill.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I speak for the young men and young women in uniform today. I speak for this Department of Defense appropriations bill. I think that this bill makes a major step in the right direction to help restore the needed dollars that have been slowly slipping away through the years.

I say to my colleagues that we have the finest young men and women in uniform that we have ever had. I know this by personal observation, by meeting with them, by speaking with them at their posts, at their bases, here in this country and, yes, in other parts of the world. It is up to us, under the Constitution of the United States, Article I, Section 8, to support the military, the Armed Forces. That is what we are

doing today. If we fail to do so properly today, shame on us because we will be letting those young men and those young women down who we have a constitutional duty to support.

This is a step in the right direction. I am pleased because it is a strong bill for our forces. The bill only increases Department of Defense spending over 1995 by \$1.7 billion. It does cut O&M, but it still remains over the President's recommendation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I had my own military budget which was in excess of this that I had been working on for quite some time.

□ 1300

If this does not meet my expectations of what we need, this is still a very, very dangerous and uncertain world in the kaleidoscope of history and what is to come in the future. We must remain strong, and this bill is a step in that right direction, though it does have compromises in it, and frankly I personally would have more dollars than it has.

To be sure, Mr. Speaker, there are philosophical differences in this bill, and, if I had my druthers, I would add funding to parts of it, and I might cut in other areas. But we must make sure that we keep the young men and young women strong, that we have enough ammunition for them, that we take care of their families, that we pay them properly, which is so important, and that we do all that we can to stand behind them in the arduous days ahead.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania spoke about the possibility of our troops going into Bosnia. Of course I think we should have a very substantial and substantive debate on that issue right here in this hall, right here in this Chamber. But if that does come to pass, we want them to be well equipped, we want them to be well maintained, we want them to be well trained. If we do not pass this bill, there is a dire consequence that might come to pass, and that is they will not be ready, they will not be supplied with proper maintenance, ammunition, and they might not be well trained.

Something has been said about the pro-life issue on this bill, and for the first time in the conference report there is positive language, positive language in the area of pro-life. I am personally pro-life, and I think that those managers on our part should be complimented for taking that step, but, if my colleagues really want to be pro-life, let us provide enough funding for the young men and young women who are to go into harm's way so that they will have the adequate training, the adequate maintenance, and the adequate equipment to protect themselves, and to do their duty, and to do their job, arduous and difficult as that duty is. That is our job, to stand behind them.

Mr. Speaker, let us fulfill our constitutional duty. Being the superpower

in this world, we must do this. We must pass this bill.

I compliment the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for an excellent job on this. I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking Democrat, for a fine job on this, and I have worked with him for these many years. I will support this bill. It is a giant step in the right direction, and I hope this House will pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], for their strong support of my amendment in the defense appropriations bill which would end Pentagon financial support for golden handshakes for top management when large defense contractors merge. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] accepted that amendment. It was passed on a voice vote, and I am very appreciative to them for that support. I am also grateful that the Senate conferees accepted this amendment and it remains in the bill that we are voting upon today.

There is honest disagreement within this body as to how much money should be appropriated for the defense purposes this coming year. That is an important debate. There should not be, however, and I do not believe that there is, any disagreement that all of the money that we appropriate for defense should go for defense, go to providing the weapons and equipment our fighting men and women need; that is where all of us want defense money to go.

As my colleagues know, the purpose of my amendment was to make sure that, if and when large defense contractors merge, no U.S. taxpayer money was to go to the CEO or top executives who negotiated those mergers, no golden handshakes from the U.S. taxpayer. As everyone knows, huge mergers are taking place every day. Whether they are good or bad is subject for another discussion. But what is relevant today is that no taxpayer dollars should be provided to millionaire executives in the defense industry as incentives to develop those mergers.

My amendment was prompted by an outrage that many of my colleagues are familiar with. In February of this year Martin Marietta Corporation merged with Lockheed. That merger triggered a previously established plan which provides \$92 million in bonuses, \$92 million in bonuses to the CEO, the board of directors, and the top-level managers of those two companies, \$92 million. What is particularly outrageous is that as part of that plan and

part of the bonuses that same plan called for the closing of 12 factories and laboratories and the laying off of 19,000 American workers. In other words, while 19,000 workers were tossed out on the street, the top executives were paid \$92 million. They were paying \$92 million to themselves.

This is an outrage, but what is an even greater outrage is that of that \$92 million, \$31 million came from the Pentagon from the U.S. taxpayers, and that, fellow colleagues, we must not allow to happen.

Within the secret agreement negotiated between the Pentagon and the two companies we found out exactly where the money has gone, and some of that information had already been published. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the President of Lockheed Martin, Norm Augustine, will receive over \$8 million in bonuses; Lamar Alexander, a member of the board of Martin Marietta, will receive \$236,000; Melvin Laird, former Secretary of Defense, would receive \$1.6 million; retired general and former member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Vessey, would receive \$372,000.

Now the problem is, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] indicated, in the conference process the Pentagon walked in with a piece of paper, and they said, well, the language might not be clear enough to stop these bonuses going to the Lockheed Martin executives despite the clear intent that was passed in this body. The purpose of the language that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will present is to lock it up, absolutely clearly, that the intent of the amendment was to stop the bonuses going to those executives, an outrageous example of corporate welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of Mr. OBEY's motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for the time.

My colleagues, when I want to make a point to Democrats, I come stand at this mike. I do not want to stand here today. I want to go over here, and I want to speak to the Republican side of the aisle because I am upset.

Let me tell my colleagues something. I have heard some young Republicans come over here, and they say they are going to vote against this bill because they are worried about body bags, and I have heard others come over here and say they are going to vote against this bill because there is too much money in it.

Now I am going to tell my young fellows and friends something. I was at a Marine Corps League meeting the other night with generals, and colonels, and captains, and enlisted men, and, to a man and woman, they wanted us to vote for this bill.

Why?

As my colleagues know, when we passed this Republic of States some 219 years ago, we did it for the primary purpose of providing a common defense and if we are going to put young men and women in harm's way in the military, we are going to give them the very best.

This is an appropriations bill. We are not supposed to be legislating in an appropriations bill—things like Bosnia body bags, things like abortion. I am a pro-lifer and for 18 years have stood here and voted that pro-life line. But that is not what this is about. We have got increases in this bill of 9, 10 and 11 percent for manpower, for readiness and for research and development that will give our men and women the best state-of-the-art weaponry we can.

Let me tell my colleagues and some of the younger Members who think they are going to come over here and vote against this thing because it has not got some body-bag language in it: You come over here, and you vote for this bill because every single man and woman serving in the military today wants you to. They know what's best for them. They know better than you do. And if you've never set foot in a military base in this country or overseas, go and ask them.

I wish we had more time to discuss this, but I am going to tell my colleagues something. Our country depends on it. If we let this bill go down, it will come back here, and it will not have the 8, 9, 10, and 11-percent increases in there. We will get shafted. That is why we must pass this bill now today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I think I just heard the gentleman say we were not supposed to attach legislative language to appropriations bills. Labor-HEW is tied up because we have a bundle of legislative language attached to that bill from their side of the aisle. Treasury-Post Office is tied up because we have got a disagreement about legislative language. We have got 30 pages out of a 90-page EPA appropriation bill that has legislative language.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say Members on their side of the aisle who are concerned about seeing activity on that question are right.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the subcommittee and a member of the conference committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to rise in support of this very, very important bill and to

say to my colleagues that I have never seen a finer piece of work done on the appropriation defense bill than done by my chairman and his colleague, the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]. It is a very, very difficult bill. It is very important to the country. It is a bill that could very well be disrupted because of some of the language that may or may not be in the bill.

A change in pattern relative to this bill; that is not what we have done in the past in terms of the appropriations process. There are places to handle policy issues that are extraneous in other bills. It is absolutely unacceptable to find ourselves in a position of putting appropriations to funding for our national defense systems in jeopardy because of people's largely single-issue interests. To me I think it is critical that the Members know that this bill will become worse if we go forward from here without passing it today.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Do not mistake the metaphorical quality of my next statements for its lack of theological basis. St. Peter on my judgment day will not ask me about the B-2 or my defense votes. He will ask me about my vote to protect innocent human life. The doctors in our military do not want to perform abortions, and for those who may not be aware of the history, there has been a pro-life rider on the appropriations bill in 1979, 1980, and 1981, and I believe the years on either side of that, but I found the documentation on that.

□ 1315

I think this is an excellent defense bill, but I have never seen a devil's deal like this since I was sworn in here in 1977. To tell me who flew the B-2, and I mean flew it, radio calls, takeoff, the entire flight, and two grease job landings, if I may say so. I want that system to defend our country. It may save lives in the dead of night. But 1½ million babies being killed should not include military hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" with a heavy heart.

The \$100 million cut by the House from the recruiting and advertising budget was restored.

Several Senate initiatives to liberalize the medical insurance program for military dependents (called CHAMPUS) were incorporated by conferees. But the report included the same general ban on the funding of abortions as that contained in the first fiscal 1981 continuing appropriations resolution (PL 96-369). PL 96-369 provided emergency funding for government departments whose regular funding bills had not been cleared by Congress as of the start of fiscal 1981. Also retained was a Senate provision authorizing a test of commercial health maintenance organizations as a substitute for CHAMPUS. (Continuing appropriations resolution, p. 168; CHAMPUS authorization legislation, see National Security chapter, p. 91).

OTHER PROVISIONS

The conferees also agreed to provisions that would: Ban abortions with appropriated funds except where the life of the mother would otherwise be endangered or in cases of rape or incest that were reported to a law enforcement agency or public health service.

MEDICAL CARE AND ABORTIONS

On a point of order, a committee provision was thrown out that would have limited reimbursement by CHAMPUS to not more than the 80th percentile of customary medical charges for comparable services.

By a vote of 226-163, the House adopted an amendment by Robert K. Dornan, R-Calif., that would bar use of funds in the bill to pay for any abortion not required to save the life of the mother. The amendment contained the same limitation that the House earlier had placed on funds appropriated to the Health, Education and Welfare Department. Between Sept. 1, 1976, and Sept. 1, 1977, about 26,500 abortions were performed in military hospitals or paid for by CHAMPUS. (Vote 584, p. 166-H)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. He and I and many members of this conference committee are all pro-life voters, 100 percent. This bill provides the Dornan language with a caveat. We did not particularly want to accept that caveat, but we were in conference and were put in a position of having to accept the caveat, but we did maintain the Dornan language.

Now, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], that we had the same problem in our conference that he has in the conference that he is a member of, and his conference is basically deadlocked over this issue. We could not afford to deadlock because we had the end of the fiscal year approaching us, and that is, of course, the end of the fiscal year, September 30. So we did not do as much as the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] wanted, but we did more than has been done for a long time on the issue of abortion on this bill. I think those of us who are pro-life can say we got a partial victory, not everything we wanted, but a partial victory.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

I want to talk a little bit about something here, the advance agreement regarding the costs allowability of benefits due to the change of control, as defined in the various plans.

Did your eyes glaze over yet, colleagues? Well, that is the idea. They are trying to put Members to sleep here, because they are trying to pull a fast one on the American taxpayer. What that language means and what this agreement says is that the U.S. Government, its U.S. taxpayers, are going to give golden parachutes to executives of failing defense contractors.

Can you believe that? There is going to be a \$92 million golden parachute to the directors of Martin Marietta.

Now, that might be OK if it was coming from the stockholders. But one-third of that money, \$31 million, is coming from the U.S. taxpayer. Somehow it is in the interests of the defense of the United States, somehow it is in the interests of the taxpayers, that we should pay the directors of a failing corporation who have merged with another corporation a subsidy.

Lamar Alexander, Republican candidate for President of the United States, the guy in the flannel shirt, the ordinary guy, he is going to get \$236,000 for merging these two companies together, \$80,000 of that paid by the U.S. taxpayers.

I do not believe anybody thinks that is right. The president of the firm is going to get \$9.2 million for merging his firm with another, putting 30,000 skilled Americans out of work, who do not get so much as a thank you or a golden watch, let alone a golden parachute. One-third of his bonus for doing this, \$3 million, will be paid by the Department of Defense, by the taxpayers of the United States of America, unless this motion to recommit is approved.

Now, everything goes on around here with a wink and a nod. This language was approved unanimously by the House of Representatives, and now they are trying to pull it out.

Mr. Speaker, vote "aye" on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must have misspoke. We are not trying to change the language. The language you offered is exactly the language accepted in the conference.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is not, in effect.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the language the gentleman offered is the exact language that we agreed to on the floor and that the conference agreed to.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is absolutely right, that the same language remains, and I thank him and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for supporting that language. But here is the problem that we have: As the gentleman knows better than I do, during the conference committee the Pentagon comes trotting down and says "Well, maybe that language won't work in stopping this outrageous series of bonuses to these executives." What we are trying to do now is bring in firm language that will work.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we hope we will be able to do this. We do not think it is necessary to recommit the bill in order to do it.

We agree with the thrust of what the gentleman was trying to do and the amendment that the gentleman offered.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and a member of the subcommittee and a member of the conference.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman YOUNG for his outstanding efforts, and thank Congressman MURTHA and all the subcommittee members for their strong support.

And our Defense Subcommittee staff led by Kevin Roper deserves special recognition for a job well done.

I know this is a tough vote for many Members. It is a tough vote for me—I have a 100-percent pro-life voting record since coming to Congress in 1977, and I am committed to standing firm with my colleagues in the pro-life community on the abortion issue on our other appropriations bills.

But I am supporting this conference agreement because the defense of our country is also critical, and because this Defense bill is the only one that has a chance to be signed into law, and because those who are thinking it will get any better by sending this bill back to conference are wrong.

Yes, we have provided funding increases in this bill—but they are increases above the President's original budget request.

They are increases to meet the highest priority shortfalls as identified by the Department of Defense such as \$322 million for the renovation of barracks and \$700 million for real property maintenance—critical quality of life issues.

The increases we provided above the President's request for shipbuilding, F-15's, F-16's, Navy aircraft, and tanks are all in the Defense Department's 5-year program.

We funded these programs now because the weapons modernization and procurement programs have been cut 70 percent since 1985.

The modest increases, and policy direction, we provide in missile defense will for the first time allow us to actually deploy effective missile defenses for our troops and citizens beginning in the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, these successes will be reversed if we do not pass this conference agreement today.

And to those who say we provide too much for defense, the \$243 billion provided in this conference agreement is the same level as last year's Defense appropriations bill that was passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by our President.

While this bill provides an increase over the President's budget, it still represents a decrease in real terms—inflation, et cetera—for the 11th consecutive year. For the last 11 years defense has been cut 35 percent in real terms.

Defense has contributed approximately \$140 billion to deficit reduction since 1985—the largest contributor.

Despite the rhetoric you constantly hear about cuts in domestic programs, until this

year non-defense domestic discretionary spending, since 1985, has increased in inflation adjusted outlay dollars by 28 percent. [Source is President's own fiscal year 1996 budget submission.]

Means tested entitlement spending over the same period has increased, when adjusted for inflation, by 38 percent. If you do not adjust for inflation, entitlements since 1985 have at least doubled or increased by over 100 percent.

Even under the Republican budget resolution we just slow the increase in domestic spending by reducing the annual growth rate in Federal spending to 3 percent.

Under the Republican budget, Medicare spending still increases by 6.4 percent a year.

Even with the slow down in non-defense domestic discretionary spending we have already provided in fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills: Plus \$255 billion in discretionary and mandatory spending in the Labor/HHS Ed fiscal year 1996 bill, this Defense bill is \$243 billion.

Another \$11.6 billion in feeding programs in the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, including \$3.7 billion for WIC—\$259.8 million over 1995 levels—and \$4.4 billion for the School Lunch Program.

Some \$37.3 billion for veterans' programs in the fiscal year 1996 VA/HUD bill. Of this amount \$16.9 billion is for veterans' medical care programs, an increase of over \$740 million from 1995 levels.

In WIC, school lunch, veterans' programs, student loans—no one currently receiving services is taken off the rolls or dropped out of the programs.

Yet, we ignore that with 11 consecutive years of cuts in real terms in Defense spending, 1.1 million Defense personnel have been dropped off the rolls—lost jobs—since 1987. Fifteen thousand people per month are losing civilian and military jobs in the Defense Department during this fiscal year.

Private sector job losses in the defense industry are estimated to be over 1 million since 1990 alone.

Remember, 64 percent of last year's DOD appropriations bill was for personnel and operations; 62 percent of this bill goes just for personnel and operations.

This bill simply puts a finger in the dike, and, if we do not pass this one it is only going to get worse.

Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted that what just transpired happened as I was about to come up here, because it highlights the problem. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] have done a wonderful job with this bill. All of the members of the committee and subcommittee have done a wonderful job with the bill. There were differences, real differences, pounded out between the House and the Senate. And yet we get a communication from the White House dated today from Alice Rivlin, Director of OMB, that says the President is going to veto the bill; too much spending. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is going to vote against the bill; too much spending. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] spoke against the bill. He does not know why. He may be wrong about the bill, but he is against it.

Then we have Republican freshmen who sent out "Dear Colleagues," and they are against it. They are against it for all sorts of reasons. Some are valid, some are not. Some say they funded the *Seawolf*. It did not matter that the Speaker and the whole northeastern establishment and the Navy all say that we need the *Seawolf*. But they are against it. They say there is too much defense conversion.

The reason the Senate insisted on the defense conversion under the TRP program, whatever that stands for, remain in, was to satisfy the President; \$175 million to satisfy the President, because, after all, they said if it is in, he will not veto it. But here it says the President is going to veto it. He is against it.

Some of our freshmen are against the fact that we are not tying the President's hands on Bosnia. We do not have language in here that says, unconstitutionally I might add, that the President, no matter what happens in Bosnia between now and the end of this next fiscal year, no matter how good the solution looks, we cannot put one troop on the ground or otherwise we are in violation of their concerns. That is preemptive. That is bad foreign policy. Basically what they seek to do is say that the President of the United States, the Commander In Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States under the Constitution of the United States, cannot act to make this a more peaceful world. They are wrong, but they are against this bill.

Then we get the right-to-life groups. I am 100 percent a pro-lifer. I believe in the sanctity of human life. But I also believe that we as Members of Congress have the right to negotiate, to debate, to compromise and come to what we believe to be in the best interests of the future of the United States and all of our citizens, and I am not going to let that one issue come between me and protecting my constituents.

This is a good bill. You can find many reasons to be against it. But if you vote against it, you are voting against the future of the United States in derogation of your responsibilities to the people of the United States, whom you are charged to represent, and I say that you are wrong.

In that event, with no further screaming or yelling, in the calm of day, I would urge all of my colleagues, no matter what their reason for being against this bill, to reflect on one thing: If Members defeat this conference report, and if Members believe that we need to provide for a strong national defense, when the bill comes back, it will not provide as well as this bill does. It will be worse when it comes back, and Members will have shot themselves in the foot.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote for this conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1¼ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of this House know, the gentleman from Louisiana and I are very good friends. But

I have to say that I think he misdescribes what our responsibilities are to the people of this country. In my view, our responsibilities are not to provide a budget which has a balanced set of budget reductions so that the pain is shared evenly and so that major portions of the appropriations are not exempted from the squeeze that is being applied to everybody else.

This bill does not meet that test. It does not even allow us over time to stay within the Republican budget that was passed with overwhelming Republican unity in this House just a few months ago. Because with all of the weapons systems piled into this bill, they will be forcing spending far in excess of the Kasich budget.

We also have a responsibility to see to it that the Congress of the United States does not embarrass itself by giveaways to corporations in the process of providing a defense bill. This bill also does not meet that test, and so the bill ought to go down until those two items are corrected.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, I have been trying to think of a good name for this bill, and I heard it from that side of the aisle. This bill is a piece of work. This bill is a piece of work that goes right after readiness. I sit on the Committee on National Security and I have sat there for 23 years, and for the last year all we have heard about is "hollow force, hollow force, hollow force. Clinton let them have a follow force." Guess what? They raided the readiness funds we put in there, and so I guess they decided maybe they like the hollow force, they said it so many times, because this bill is less in readiness than Clinton's bill.

It is \$7 billion more than the Pentagon asked for. Imagine. We did not even do that during the cold war. It is really just a wonderful goodie package for all the defense contractors. We have loaded in all of these wonderful goodies and corporate benefits that the Defense Department did not ask for. They did not ask for B-2's, they did not ask for all of this.

And if you look at the funny, fuzzy accounting in here, which Alice Rivlin has and has sent us a letter, it is very troubling, because I think it is even way over the \$7 billion, because they played with the inflation fund. I guess they do not think inflation is going to be what DOD thinks it is, and on and on and on.

But I must say, for all of that, I am even more troubled by a letter that was sent to the President by the chairman apparently and the ranking member. If I can just quote two lines out of this, I think this is devastating. They are saying, "As a consequence, therefore we cannot fathom why a bill such as this is being considered for a presidential veto." They say it becomes

even more troubling at a time when demands on our Armed Forces appear to be on the rise when you are talking about a negotiated settlement in Bosnia.

That sounds to me like a deal is cut. Hey, let us have all the weapons, and we will let you have whatever you want in Bosnia. I think that is troubling, and I think that is what is bothering an awful lot of people in this Chamber.

Vote aye on recommitment and vote no on the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points that I think are important. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made the recommendation in the subcommittee that we eliminate the language on Bosnia. He felt it was very important, because the White House was objecting to that language. I, on the other hand, had a great concern about eliminating the language.

Now, since that time we have got a commitment from the White House, I believe, to come to us for authorization and appropriation of money before they commit troops to Bosnia. So I think it is not a good characterization. I think he can be rightly upset because we thought this took care of one of the problems that would help us keep the bill from being vetoed.

I still do not believe the President will veto this bill, if we work our way down the road. We are hopeful that the changes we made in raising TRP, in making a compromise on Nunn-Lugar, by eliminating the Bosnia language, we hope that we will be able to get a bill through.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my concern was the letter from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG]. The way I really read this three-page letter, it basically says to the President, if you veto this bill, then we will not be positive about Bosnia. First of all, I think that is inappropriate to say to the Commander in Chief.

□ 1330

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The fact is that that was a misinterpretation of our intent. Our intent is to say that we are providing what we believe to be the modicum needs for the Armed Forces of the United States. If the President makes an incursion into Bosnia, he is going to be expected to spend anywhere from \$3 to \$4 billion. I would ask the President to tell us

where the money is coming from and what does he want us to do, and maybe we can work it out. But do not veto this bill and expect to get less and then want us to go into Bosnia. That does not make sense.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think we have gotten the message across to the White House. I think the compromise we have made on this issue they recognize, and I think the Congress will have a very important role.

The fact they are meeting right now to consult with the Congress is a very important part of this overall solution to this problem.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire how much time is remaining on all three sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 3¼ minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] has 5½ minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 5 minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], a strong pro-lifer and a strong defense supporter.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to take my colleagues on this side of the aisle back to 1 year ago this week when we gathered in front of the Capitol to sign the Contract With America. One of the basic tenets of the contract was to ensure a strong national defense for our country. This bill for the first time in years moves us toward this fundamental goal and deserves an "aye" vote.

I also want to address the abortion issue that has been of concern to many of my colleagues. I have a strong pro-life record on abortion and a strong philosophical belief in the preservation of life. I've voted in committee and on the floor for an amendment to prohibit abortions in military hospitals abroad. While I continue to support this issue, we shouldn't kill this bill on this issue. We have increased procurement, research, and quality of life accounts in this bill while reducing spending on nondefense items. This is a good bill that prodefense members should support.

I urge an "aye" vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has the right to close, then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], and that he be permitted to control that time so that he will have 5 minutes to close.

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

There was no objection.

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

and I would like to say, in closing our argument. I do think that we did the best we could do on this bill. Let me say to the pro-life people, I resisted tremendous pressure from the Democratic side several years ago to put language in the bill which would have allowed abortions overseas. We did not put that language in our bill because we thought that would be inappropriate. We thought the pro-life position was the right position and we resisted that position.

I would hope the Members would take that into consideration. It sounds like we need a medic here to save this bill because everybody is talking negative. I think we have a good bill. I think we have a bill that is as good as we can get, and I hope we will be able to convince the White House to sign the bill when it finally gets to them. I would urge the Members to vote for a reasonable defense bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

This is a very, very difficult position, I think, for many of us on the pro-life side to be in. Let me make it very clear why many pro-life Members of Congress oppose this conference report. We do not contend that supporters of the report are necessarily pro-abortion. Indeed, the opposite is true: the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member are very pro-life. But sadly, the fact of the matter is that this is a pro-abortion bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House voted to prohibit abortions in our military hospitals. The conference report will allow abortions in these hospitals for any reason whatsoever without limitation. Members of Congress who ordinarily vote against abortion can support this legislation if, and only if, they have not read the language carefully or, perhaps, if they have other priorities that come before the unborn child.

How important are the lives of these children that would be put at risk if this conference report were to be enacted into law? If your life or mine, I say to my friends, if your life or mine were at risk or in jeopardy of being either chemically poisoned or killed by a dismemberment, or by a suction machine, would voting down this conference report be so difficult to do?

I would suggest and submit that we all know that eventually a conference report will be passed, or perhaps as part of a CR we will fund the Department of Defense. It is a matter of when. It is not a matter of if.

Mr. Speaker, let me also point out to Members that the Dornan language is carried over in this bill, but then there is gutting language. One person referred to it as a "caveat." It completely and totally negates the operative section of the Dornan language.

Let me also remind Members that all of the pro-life groups—the Christian Coalition, the National Right to Life Committee—reluctantly but, nevertheless firmly, have come down and asked for a no vote on this DOD conference report.

It is a very difficult situation for all of us to be in. I do not like it, nobody likes it, but if we want to save the unborn, if we want to save them from the cruelty of abortion, a no vote is the only way to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 1 1/4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has one speaker remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that I think Members have given ample reason for opposing the bill in general. I would also urge that they support the motion to recommit for the simple reason that it prevents a \$31 million ripoff of the taxpayers to the United States, a ripoff which will enrich a few corporate directors while the workers of that same company are being laid off.

I do not think that is a proposition any of us can go home and explain to any of our constituents, and I do not think we should even try. So I would urge the adoption of the recommittal motion and the defeat of the bill.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 698]

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	Coyne	Ewing	LaTourrette	Rivers
Allard	Brown (OH)	Cramer	Farr	Laughlin	Roberts
Andrews	Brownback	Crane	Fattah	Lazio	Roemer
Archer	Bryant (TN)	Crapo	Fawell	Leach	Rohrabacher
Armey	Bryant (TX)	Cremeans	Fazio	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Bachus	Bunn	Cubin	Fields (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Rose
Baesler	Bunning	Cunningham	Filner	Lewis (GA)	Roth
Baker (CA)	Burr	Danner	Flake	Lewis (KY)	Roukema
Baker (LA)	Burton	Davis	Flanagan	Lightfoot	Roybal-Allard
Baldacci	Buyer	de la Garza	Foglietta	Lincoln	Royce
Ballenger	Calvert	Deal	Foley	Linder	Rush
Barcia	Camp	DeFazio	Forbes	Lipinski	Sabo
Barr	Canady	DeLauro	Ford	Livingston	Salmon
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Diaz-Balart	Fowler	LoBiondo	Sanders
Barrett (WI)	Castle	Dickey	Fox	Lofgren	Sanford
Bartlett	Chabot	Dicks	Franks (CT)	Longley	Sawyer
Barton	Chambliss	Dingell	Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Saxton
Bass	Chapman	Dixon	Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Scarborough
Bateman	Chenoweth	Doggett	Frisa	Luther	Schaefer
Becerra	Christensen	Dooley	Funderburk	Maloney	Schiff
Beilenson	Chryslers	Doolittle	Furse	Manton	Schroeder
Bentsen	Clay	Dornan	Galleghy	Manzullo	Schumer
Bereuter	Clayton	Doyle	Ganske	Markey	Scott
Bevill	Clement	Dreier	Gejdenson	Martinez	Seastrand
Bilbray	Clinger	Duncan	Gekas	Martini	Sensenbrenner
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Dunn	Gephardt	Mascara	Serrano
Bishop	Coble	Durbin	Geren	Matsui	Shadegg
Bliley	Coburn	Edwards	Gilchrest	McCarthy	Shaw
Blute	Coleman	Ehlers	Gillmor	McCollum	Shays
Boehlert	Collins (GA)	Ehrlich	Gonzalez	McCrary	Shuster
Boehner	Collins (MI)	Emerson	Goodlatte	McDade	Sisisky
Bonilla	Combest	Engel	Goodling	McDermott	Skaggs
Bono	Condit	English	Gordon	McHale	Skeen
Borski	Conyers	Ensign	Goss	McInnis	Skelton
Boucher	Cooley	Eshoo	Graham	McIntosh	Slaughter
Brewster	Costello	Evans	Green	McKeon	Smith (MI)
Browder	Cox	Everett	Greenwood	McKinney	Smith (NJ)
			Gunderson	McNulty	Smith (TX)
			Gutierrez	Meehan	Smith (WA)
			Gutknecht	Meek	Solomon
			Hall (OH)	Menendez	Souder
			Hall (TX)	Metcalf	Spence
			Hancock	Meyers	Spratt
			Hansen	Mfume	Stearns
			Harman	Mica	Stenholm
			Hastert	Miller (CA)	Stockman
			Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Stokes
			Hastings (WA)	Mineta	Studs
			Hayes	Minge	Stump
			Hayworth	Mink	Stupak
			Hefley	Molinari	Talent
			Hefner	Mollohan	Tanner
			Heineman	Montgomery	Tate
			Herger	Moorhead	Tauzin
			Hilleary	Moran	Taylor (MS)
			Hilliard	Morella	Taylor (NC)
			Hinchey	Murtha	Thomas
			Hobson	Myers	Thornberry
			Hoekstra	Myrick	Thornton
			Hoke	Nadler	Thurman
			Holden	Neal	Tiahrt
			Horn	Nethercutt	Torkildsen
			Hostettler	Neumann	Torres
			Houghton	Ney	Torricelli
			Hunter	Norwood	Towns
			Hutchinson	Nussle	Traficant
			Hyde	Oberstar	Upton
			Inglis	Obey	Velazquez
			Istook	Olver	Vento
			Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Visclosky
			Jefferson	Orton	Volkmer
			Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Vucanovich
			Johnson (SD)	Packard	Waldholtz
			Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Walsh
			Johnson, Sam	Parker	Wamp
			Johnston	Pastor	Ward
			Jones	Paxon	Waters
			Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Watt (NC)
			Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Watts (OK)
			Kasich	Pelosi	Weldon (FL)
			Kelly	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
			Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (MN)	Weller
			Kennedy (RI)	Petri	White
			Kennelly	Pickett	Whitfield
			Kildee	Pombo	Wicker
			Kim	Pomeroy	Williams
			King	Portman	Wise
			Kingston	Poshard	Wolf
			Kleczka	Pryce	Woolsey
			Klink	Quinn	Wyden
			Klug	Radanovich	Wynn
			Knollenberg	Rahall	Yates
			Kolbe	Ramstad	Young (AK)
			LaFalce	Rangel	Young (FL)
			LaHood	Reed	Zeliff
			Lantos	Regula	Zimmer
			Largent	Richardson	
			Latham	Riggs	