

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, in the context of this discussion regarding the balanced budget, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seek three objectives: One, to change the nature, function, and role of the Federal Government in people's lives; two, to significantly reduce the size of the Federal Government; and, three, to shrink the revenues designed to carry out the purpose, the business of Federal governance. Nothing can be more fundamental and basic than that, to change the definition of the role of the Federal Government in people's lives.

It would seem to me if this struggle is that fundamental, then you do not solve that problem by creating the artificial crises of shutting down the Government. Dignify your own fundamental struggle here, allow the workers to get back to work, allow the Federal Government to function, and within the context of the processes that are designed for us to deal with these problems, let us address it that way. This is a fundamental basic struggle here. It is not a testosterone test. It is not an ego trip. It is a fundamental discussion. We ought to have it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, December 28, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 5 of rule III of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Thursday, December 28, 1995 at 5:30 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he returns without his approval H.R. 1530, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996."

With warm regards,
ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-155)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1530, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996."

H.R. 1530 would unacceptably restrict my ability to carry out this country's national security objectives and substantially interfere with the implemen-

tation of key national defense programs. It would also restrict the President's authority in the conduct of foreign affairs and as Commander in Chief, raising serious constitutional concerns.

First, the bill requires deployment by 2003 of a costly missile defense system able to defend all 50 States from a long-range missile threat that our Intelligence Community does not foresee in the coming decade. By forcing such an unwarranted deployment decision now, the bill would waste tens of billions of dollars and force us to commit prematurely to a specific technological option. It would also likely require a multiple-site architecture that cannot be accommodated within the term of the existing ABM Treaty. By setting U.S. policy on a collision course with the ABM Treaty, the bill would jeopardize continued Russian implementation of the START I Treaty as well as Russian ratification of START II—two treaties that will significantly lower the threat to U.S. national security, reducing the number of U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear warheads by two-thirds from Cold War levels. The missile defense provisions would also jeopardize our current efforts to agree on an ABM/TMD (Theater Missile Defense) demarcation with the Russian Federation.

Second, the bill imposes restrictions on the President's ability to conduct contingency operations essential to national security. Its restrictions on funding of contingency operations and the requirement to submit a supplemental appropriations request within a time certain in order to continue a contingency operation are unwarranted restrictions on a President's national security and foreign policy prerogatives. Moreover, by requiring a Presidential certification to assign U.S. Armed Forces under United Nations operational or tactical control, the bill infringes on the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief.

Third, H.R. 1530 contains other objectionable provisions that would adversely affect the ability of the Defense Department to carry out national defense programs or impede the Department's ability to manage its day-to-day operations. For example, the bill includes counterproductive certification requirements for the use of Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) funds and restricts use of funds for individual CTR programs.

Other objectionable provisions eliminate funding for the Defense Enterprise Fund; restrict the retirement of U.S. strategic delivery systems; slow the pace of the Defense Department's environmental cleanup efforts; and restrict Defense's ability to expedite disaster relief, demining, and military-to-military contact programs. The bill also directs the procurement of specific submarines at specific shipyards although that is not necessary for our military mission to maintain the Nation's industrial base.

H.R. 1530 also contains two provisions that would unfairly affect certain service members. One requires medically unwarranted discharge procedures for HIV-positive service members. In addition, I remain very concerned about provisions that would restrict service women and female dependents of military personnel from obtaining privately funded abortions in military facilities overseas, except in cases of rape, incest, or danger to the life of the mother. In many countries, these U.S. facilities provide the only accessible, safe source for these medical services. Accordingly, I urge the Congress to repeal a similar provision that became law in the "Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996."

In returning H.R. 1530 to the Congress, I recognize that it contains a number of important authorities for the Department of Defense, including authority for Defense's military construction program and the improvement of housing facilities for our military personnel and their families. It also contains provisions that would contribute to the effective and efficient management of the Department, including important changes in Federal acquisition law.

Finally, H.R. 1530 includes the authorization for an annual military pay raise of 2.4 percent, which I strongly support. The Congress should enact this authorization as soon as possible, in separate legislation that I will be sending up immediately. In the meantime, I will today sign an Executive order raising military pay for the full 2.0 percent currently authorized by the Congress and will sign an additional order raising pay by a further 0.4 percent as soon as the Congress authorizes that increase.

I urge the Congress to address the Administration's objections and pass an acceptable National Defense Authorization Act promptly. The Department of Defense must have the full range of authorities that it needs to perform its critical worldwide missions.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 28, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for 1 hour.

□ 1415

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President made a monumental mistake last week

when he vetoed the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization bill. On a purely political level, the veto has even more clearly defined the stark differences between the Clinton administration and this Congress on key national security issues such as ballistic missile defense and United Nations' control of U.S. military forces—central elements in both the Contract With America and the President's veto.

Unfortunately, against the real-world backdrop of hazardous peacekeeping deployment to Bosnia over a cold and wet holiday season, the President's veto of a bill containing a number of important pay and benefit provisions represents a slap in the face of our military personnel and their families.

First and foremost, this bill is about improving the quality of life of the All Volunteer Force. Contrasted against the President's vehement opposition to the deployment of a national missile defense system by the year 2003 or the bill's limitations on the President's ability to place U.S. military forces under the control of the United Nations—provisions the American people overwhelmingly support—vetoing the bill and risking these quality of life provisions is incomprehensible.

There are really two issues underlying the President's veto. First, the President opposes the ballistic missile defense provisions in the bill that call for the deployment of a national missile defense system by the year 2003. A bipartisan majority of the Members of both the House and Senate support this provision, but apparently not this administration. The missile defense system called for would be consistent with the ABM Treaty and, contrary to the wild assertions of it costing tens of billions of dollars, could be operational for a fraction of the costs based on the Pentagon's own estimates.

The second veto issue is even more of a red herring. The bill contains a provision simply requiring the President to certify in advance that any future deployment of U.S. military troops under the operational control of the United Nations is in the U.S. national security interest. It does not preclude the President from putting U.S. troops under U.N. control, it simply requires the President to certify to the Congress that such an arrangement is in the U.S. national security interests. The President has vetoed the entire Defense authorization bill in large part based on a requirement for a certification.

This veto indicates to me that despite the fact that the conferees went out of their way to accommodate the administration's concerns on numerous provisions, including provisions on ballistic missile defense and U.N. command and control, the White House is truly not interested in having a Defense authorization bill this year. Yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried an op-ed stating that, "with his veto of the 1996 Defense bill last week, President Clinton just made the world a more dangerous place." It is difficult to disagree.

If, as a result of the veto, we are reduced to political jockeying instead of advancing the numerous quality of life and reform provisions contained in this bill, so be it. This is the President's decision. At a minimum, therefore, today's override vote will provide each of us an opportunity to choose where our national security priorities truly lie.

Finally, to those who might have voted against this legislation in other form, or for whatever reason it is a bipartisan product of the Congress, both parties, both Houses—its our bill that the President vetoed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as we all are aware, we are here addressing the issue of the President's veto of the Defense authorization bill.

The main focus of the President's veto message had to do with the issue of ballistic missile defense and the ABM Treaty. Before I go into the specifics of that, I would like to set the record straight.

In my capacity, Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member, I sat with the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], who is the present chair of the Committee on National Security. When the Secretary of Defense briefed us in extensive detail on what would invite a veto from this administration, there were a number of issues on that list, Mr. Speaker. The one issue that was very clearly communicated to us was that the ABM Treaty potential violation, the provisions of the ballistic missile defense contained in the bill could indeed invite a veto.

Over the course of the conference process, there were a few meetings addressing this issue attended by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HUNTER], the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, this gentleman, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] with members of the other body. At that time, on the issue of ballistic missile defense/ABM Treaty, the comment was made very clearly: "You have two options. Either you want this as a political issue, or you want to address the problem and we get a conference report."

I would suggest, without fear of contradiction, Mr. Speaker, that it was the former decision as opposed to the latter; they wanted the issue, not the conference report.

In the other body, a provision was passed that was the result of a bipartisan effort of a group of Members of the other body selected by the majority leader of the other body. This gentleman and other Members on the Democratic side of the aisle indicated that we were prepared, though not totally pleased with all of the provisions, but in the spirit of collegiality, in the spirit of compromise, we were prepared to live with that language. Easy way to solve the problem. No one was totally

happy, but to get the job done, we could come together around the bipartisan language contained in the Defense authorization bill established by Members of the other body. It was not done.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker, with a veto message from the President, and he vetoed for several reasons. I would like to reiterate the main reason: Ballistic missile defense/ABM Treaty. Because the provisions of the conference report that passed required the deployment of a national missile defense system by the year 2003 of a costly missile defense system able to defend all 50 States from a long-range missile threat that our intelligence community, for which we authorize and appropriate billions of dollars, has stated without equivocation that they do not foresee such a threat coming in the next decade, though this bill, this conference report, commits us to deployment by the year 2003.

Mr. Speaker, that has enormous implications. Implication No. 1: It forces an unwarranted deployment decision now that does not have to be made. The threat assessment does not warrant deployment at this time.

Second, it wastes tens of billions of dollars, tens of billions of dollars, at a time when we are handwringing about balanced budgets.

One or two of my colleagues will rise today and say, "But I was in a briefing that said that X contractor or X service said 'we could do it for this amount of money.'"

Mr. Speaker, this is a legislative body. We have a responsibility to the legislative process. Not one hearing has been held to sustain or to reject the integrity of that assertion. What is on the record at this point sustains this gentleman's assertion that to go forward will cost us tens of billions of dollars, at a time when we are talking about guaranteeing the future for our children, balancing the budget on the backs of people in this country least able to handle the pain and the shock of withdrawing the Government's ability to address their human misery, tens of billions of dollars to address a threat that is not out there.

It also then, Mr. Speaker, prematurely commits us to a specific technological approach to the deployment that may or may not be obsolete next year or the year after or by the year 2003. This would likely require a multiple-site architecture, a multiple-site architecture that cannot be accommodated within the framework of the ABM Treaty as it is presently designed. Thus, it requires us to abrogate the ABM Treaty.

Responsibility, integrity, fiduciary responsibility to our American citizens would, at a minimum, Mr. Speaker, require that any time you start to tread on the waters of abrogating a treaty, it would dictate that we walk lightly, we tread gently, and we move with responsibility. To take bold steps to abrogate a treaty at this point in this gentleman's opinion makes no sense.

Mr. Speaker, this would jeopardize continued Russian implementation of START I, as well as ratification of START II Treaties. Now, START I and START II significantly reduce the nuclear inventory on this planet. We talk about the future for our children. What could be more important to the future of our children than to remove thousands of heinous nuclear weapons that have only one function, and that is to destroy life on this planet? We place that in jeopardy by making moves that unilaterally communicate to the Russians our desire to abrogate a treaty.

It jeopardizes our current efforts to agree on an ABM/theater missile defense demarcation with the Russian federation. Mr. Speaker, at this time we are engaged, this country and the Russians, engaged in a process to address the problem of the distinction between strategic weapons and theater missiles.

I am sure, and I would attempt to jog your memory, Mr. Speaker, but when we negotiated the ABM Treaty, there was no such thing as theater ballistic missiles, so the question of the speed and the range, at what point does a weapon cease to be strategic, or at what point does a weapon cease to be theater, is very significant. We are involved in that process at this point. Why engage in any activity that would jeopardize those efforts to reach an agreement? Again, it flies in the face of reality, and it makes no sense to this gentleman.

There are a few other reasons why the President vetoed this. I would only hit upon four additional areas.

First, it imposes restrictions on the President's ability to conduct contingency operations essential to national security by requiring submission of supplemental appropriations within a time certain.

Second, it infringes upon the President's constitutional authority from his perspective as Commander in Chief by requiring certain Presidential certifications. Therefore, these two areas are areas of constitutional prerogatives that have been bandied back and forth between the Congress and the executive branch of Government over the years, and the President, looking at this bill, said, "This infringes upon my constitutional rights in this area," and has vetoed it. This gentleman's belief is that in many of these areas, we are in gray areas, but I tend to believe the President is correct in this area.

I would just highlight two additional areas where the President calls to our attention reasons for veto.

One of them, it slows the pace of the Defense Department's environmental cleanup program. We have all, many of us in these Chambers, our communities have been affected by base closures. How, then, can we transfer that land on those bases back to the community for higher and better use, allowing them to convert these closed military bases so they do not sit there as pink elephants or white elephants in the middle of the

community, how can we transfer that land back to the community for higher and better use, allowing them to convert their economy from a reliance on military presence to peacetime presence if we cut moneys out designed to clean the base?

□ 1430

So how can you on the one hand say to people in your community, we want to help you overcome the adverse impact of removing the military's presence from your community, and then say, but we are not going to put sufficient moneys in the environmental restoration and cleanup fund to allow that to happen expeditiously? That makes not sense to this gentleman.

Any community out there that is adversely affected by base closure, we ought to be leaning over backward to try to help those communities move forward as rapidly as they can into the 21st century, but shaving off dollars for environmental cleanup in order to build ships that we can build in the year 2000 and bring them into 1995; and other weapons systems that we have brought into this to cut environmental restoration, it just does not make any sense, but it tells us where our priorities are.

Our priorities in this bill certainly are not related to community, and I think that is where we ought to be.

The final point that I would like to highlight is that this bill requires medically unwarranted discharge procedures for HIV-positive service members. I would just make one final point on this. Military service people said they do not need this provision. If there is a reason for discharge, present law handles it. But to have that across-the-board, blanket requirement that you must now discharge people who are HIV-positive is oppressive, it is prejudicial, and it ought to be beneath us as American people in terms of how we address and how we treat people, particularly those who have decided to serve their country in this particular capacity.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks explaining why I believe my colleagues ought to support the President's veto and sustain the President's veto, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us passed the House, it passed the Senate, went to the President, and he vetoed it. To me, it is absolutely astounding that he would veto the Defense authorization bill immediately on the heels of his deploying 20,000 United States troops in harm's way in Bosnia.

But he vetoed it. So a vote to sustain his veto, or a "no" vote on this motion

to override, in effect says, we are willing to send you into harm's way, but, by the way, we are not going to pay you.

A vote to override the President is a vote to pay the troops in Bosnia.

Moreover, a vote to sustain the veto, as my friends on the other side would have you do, says to military families, despite the fact that your housing is substandard and 70 percent of their housing is inadequate, we will not fix your housing, we do not want to repair your facilities, we do not care about your quality of life. Those repairs are authorized in this bill, and unless this veto is overridden, they will not be made.

It also says, we will not clean up environmental problems caused by the base closures. It also says to the military retirees, we will not pay your COLA's; and it also says to the men and women of this country and to the men and women of the armed services of this Nation that defending this Nation and defending you from a potential missile attack from any rouge element in the world is too expensive. That is what the President said when he vetoed this bill.

I do not know why he wants to stick to the tenets of the ABM Treaty, which was conceived in 1972 before all of these horrendous weapons systems were created, but in fact, he does; and when President Clinton called for more money last year, as we did, for the military and this year vetoes this bill, he is speaking in tongues.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 2, 1996]

THE ABM TREATY'S THREAT

With his veto of the 1996 defense bill last week, President Clinton just made the world a more dangerous place. If there's a silver lining, it is that it sets down an important political marker for this year's presidential campaign. GOP upstart Steve Forbes also put down a marker last week, castigating Bob Dole and the Senate for their apparent willingness to ratify the Start II treaty—a "further pretext," Mr. Forbes said, for the "policy of leaving the American people vulnerable to missile attack."

Given the current Senate, the President's veto is almost certain to be sustained, hamstringing the effort to build critically needed defenses against ballistic missile attack. Millions of Americans may pay for his decision with their lives, when some future commander-in-chief lacks the means to shoot down a ballistic missile heading on a lethal trajectory for an American city. By vetoing the bill, Mr. Clinton also shows that he has no viable strategy for dealing with the changed nuclear realities of the post-Cold War world—realities that are discussed nearby by former Reagan Defense official Fred C. Ikle.

The Administration, to the extent it's thinking at all instead of repeating Democratic party rote, remains mired in an obsolete mindset that sees Moscow as our main foe and regards arms control and "mutual assured destruction" as the centerpiece of policy. Mr. Clinton's principal objection to the GOP defense bill is that by requiring deployment of a missile-defense system by 2003 it would violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty under which the U.S. and the Soviet Union agreed not to defend themselves against missile attack.

The Republican bill is "on a collision course with the ABM treaty," Mr. Clinton said in his veto message. That, as we see it, is precisely the point. The ABM Treaty is a grave danger to national security and the United States ought to exercise its prerogative to withdraw. If any progress toward defense is to be made, every Republican Presidential candidate ought to pledge to give the required notice on his first day in office.

We thought back in 1972 that agreeing not to defend against missile attack was a reckless promise, but today any vestige of a rationale has vanished. More than two-dozen nations already possess ballistic missiles and a number will soon have missiles capable of reaching across the Atlantic or the Pacific. It's not hard to imagine that Washington or San Francisco would make tempting targets for a lunatic leader in one of the Iraqs or North Korea of the world. When that happens, it will be too late to start building a missile defense.

The ABM Treaty is just one relic of the Cold War that Mr. Clinton is intent on preserving. He further objects that it would derail his arms-control efforts, keeping the Russian Duma from ratifying Start II, under which Russia would reduce its nuclear arsenal to 3,500 warheads from about 8,000. Whatever the Duma does, it looks likely that the U.S. Senate will ratify Salt II three years after it was signed by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin. Perfunctory debate ended last week and a vote is expected soon. Mr. Forbes, free of the impact of past habit, is one of the few Republican voices urging against ratification.

Yet with few exceptions, Republicans do believe that defending America against missile attack ought to be a national priority. Their Congress has put forward a workable and affordable plan toward that goal. On the other hand, we have a President who's decided that it is more important to the security of the United States to reduce the number of Russian nuclear warheads than to have the capability to defend ourselves against missile attack from the madmen of the world.

As for Start II, somehow we don't find it very comforting to contemplate a world in which the Russians have 4,500 fewer scary things tucked away in their arsenal but a Saddam Hussein has one that he intends to use on us. Clearly it's time for a new security strategy. It will require more, but missile defense will be a cornerstone. Mr. Iklé argues that to wake the world to this obvious need may well take a nuclear explosion, either accidental or deliberate.

[From the USA Today, Dec. 1, 1994]

CLINTON SEEKS \$25B MORE FOR MILITARY
(By Bill Nichols)

President Clinton said Thursday he wants \$25 billion more in military spending over the next six years to improve quality of life for military personnel, increase their pay and boost troop readiness.

In an announcement some saw as an attempt to preempt Republican plans to boost military spending next year, Clinton said unexpected military deployments in the Persian Gulf, Haiti and elsewhere contributed to the budget shortfall.

"I have pledged that . . . our military will remain the best-trained, best-equipped, the best fighting force on Earth," Clinton said. "We ask much of our military and we owe much to them."

Some Republicans weren't impressed.

"This is a small step in the right direction but it does not go far enough," said Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz.

But the White House said the increase request wasn't prompted by politics or by earlier cuts in the military budget.

Even in an era when the public wants a leaner government, "the people of this country expect us to do right by our men and women in uniform," Clinton said.

Said Republican strategist William Kristol: "See, the Republican Congress is already having an effect."

Details:

The \$25 billion would cover a projected \$49 billion shortfall over six years, created in part by a congressionally mandated pay hike for military personnel.

Rep. Ike Skelton, D-Mo., outgoing chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on military forces and personnel, said the Pentagon would still face a \$15 billion shortfall.

Deputy Defense Secretary John Deutch said the gap would be closed with the additional \$25 billion plus more favorable economic assumptions from the Congressional Budget Office and "modernization reductions" at the Pentagon.

The White House did not specify where the \$25 billion would come from.

In addition, Clinton asked for at least \$2 billion to pay for unexpected operations in Kuwait, Haiti, Bosnia-Herzegovina and to deter Cuban refugees.

Among the quality-of-life improvements the money would pay for: more military family housing, increased child care and improved barracks for single men and women.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to address an issue raised by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the previous speaker in the well.

I might call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, something that I am sure you are aware of, and that is that there is a bill that has been passed in the other body, it is Senate bill 1514, to be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives, a separate piece of legislation addressing the issue of the pay of military troops. Therefore, if my colleagues are interested in addressing the issue of the pay of military troops, there is a bill at the desk that can be brought up to maintain the integrity of that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that he made that point. I would make one further point, and that is that the President did sign the defense appropriations bill. I am sure the appropriations chairman knew that. So the appropriation for the Defense Department is up and running, and people are indeed getting paid. So I do not think we need to run those kind of scare tactics out here.

This is not an appropriations bill. This is not an agency that needs a continuing resolution. This is an authorization bill, and it is really embarrassing that we are dealing with this bill after the appropriation bill has already passed anyway. This is really passé. But some of the reasons that have been given for sustaining the President's veto I think are terribly important.

Obviously, Senator NUNN in the Senate is, I think, a very esteemed Mem-

ber that people look to, and as he pointed out over and over and over again, if you want to see all sorts of earmarking, you ought to see this bill. This bill is earmarked 101.

He points out that every single line of the National Guard and Reserve procurement funds have been earmarked. There are no general categories left. The Department of Defense, all sorts of unrequested projects at undesignated sites have been earmarked. I could go on and on and on. For anybody who would like, there is a three-page letter over here with all of the things that he is upset about.

The gentleman from California has made a very eloquent statement in behalf of the President that all I can say is ditto, ditto, ditto, because he is absolutely right on, about the very seriousness of saying to the State Department and the executive branch, oh, you do not know what you are doing; we can go ahead and do this. This will not really violate the treaty. We do not need hearings on this. We know better than you.

I do not think so. This is a great display of arrogance, I think, if we proceed and do this, and I think the President is absolutely correct. It we are so sure we are right, why are we not having hearings, and why have we not really made our case in public?

But to run it out this way and run over some very serious treaties with parts of the world that are not the most stable is, I think, very, very dangerous, and I think the President is right on that too.

It also authorizes way more than this administration asks for. For heaven's sake, we have the Government partially closed down; we are spending all sorts of money and angst over that. Never, never, even during the cold war, did we authorize more money than the administration asked for, and yet we did in this budget. This was like a feeding frenzy.

I must say as an American citizen, one of the things that bothers me the most in here too is the message we are sending to service women and to dependents of servicemen and saying to them, nice that you gave up your rights to go protect our rights, and we are not going to give you the same rights that any other American would have. The fact that we would deny them the right to privately finance abortions when the health of the mother could be jeopardized is absolutely unconscionable in 1996 when they are out there defending freedom and liberty for the rest of us.

Why are we throwing political firecrackers into the military personnel system? That is what we are doing. We are taking political firecrackers and throwing them into the personnel system?

The other political firecracker we throw in there that the military says we do not need, this is divisive, it is not a problem, we can handle this, are the regulations on HIV-positive. Why

are we doing these things? I think this is a political embarrassment.

I certainly hope that people vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding time to me.

Let me tell my colleagues, this is a basic difference between the President of the United States and the Republican majority in the House, the full House, and the American people whom they represent, because we do want to have a defense against incoming ballistic missiles.

The President does not want to have a defense against incoming ballistic missiles. In 1991 in the wake of Desert Storm, after we saw those Scud missiles come in and do damage against our troops, we rose as a body in both bodies, the House and the Senate, and we passed a mandate that we should build a defense, a national defense, against incoming ballistic missiles, and that we should have that defense completed by, guess when? 1996.

Well, folks, it is 1996, the Berlin Wall was down at that time when we made that mandate, so this was not in consideration of the cold war, and we have not done a thing toward that goal that both Houses set in motion. In fact, some of the leaders on the Democratic side who have urged the President to veto this bill on the basis that it defends America were authors of that initial legislation that says, we should defend America.

Now, on a couple of specifics. We had three basic elements in our plan to defend this country against ballistic missiles. One was that we shall deploy a system, we shall deploy a system; No. 2, it shall be at multiple sites, not just one site; and No. 3, that it shall be by the year 2003.

To pacify the President on this issue, we took out the second element, the multiple sites. We took that out. I objected to taking that out, and a number of other Members did, but we took it out to get a bill. Now the President says that it implies that we shall likely require multiple sites, so it is still not quite good enough.

We want to defend America; the President does not. Let us override his veto.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill when it passed the House. I thought the parts of it I objected to would be cured in conference. Some were, some were not. So I decided reluctantly to vote

against the conference report, and today I vote reluctantly to sustain the veto.

I want to address the very provisions that the gentleman just in the well took up, namely, the parts of the bill to which the President objected and singled out that deal with ballistic missile defense and the ABM Treaty.

This year, Mr. Speaker, each House adopted in the authorization bill what amounts to a special chapter devoted solely to ballistic missile defense and the ABM Treaty. In the Senate, this chapter was painstakingly worked out, and in the end it represented a compromise that almost everyone agreed to, the Clinton administration included. The Senate vote in favor of it was overwhelming: 85 to 13. So in conference, on the Democratic side, we offered a straightforward, simple, efficient solution. We said we would take the Senate provisions in toto, completely.

Now in 12 years of going to defense conferences, this is the first that I can recall where the House conferees or some of us said to the Senate, we will buy your language lock, stock, and barrel, only to have the Senate conferees say to us, sorry, it is not for sale anymore.

That is exactly what happened in this conference. Having cut a deal on ballistic missile defense, having voted for the deal and the bill that contained it, Senator DOLE and others in the Senate decided that they had to have more. Senator NUNN told us in conference, look, you can have it one way or the other. You can have a defense bill or you can make a political statement, but not both, and the Republican conferees in the House and Senate chose to do the latter and refused to compromise further; and so here we are in January without an authorization act.

□ 1445

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If we did not compromise, why did we take out the multiple-site language to accommodate the President?

Mr. SPRATT. I was getting ready to take that up right now. I thank the gentleman for bringing that up.

I will admit that this draft that we have before us does smooth the sharpest edges off the original earlier drafts that dealt with ballistic missile defense and the ABM Treaty. But this bill would require the President to renegotiate the treaty with the Russians now, when START II has yet to be ratified, and the politics in Russia are hardly propitious for ratification.

Second, it would imply that the United States should break out of the treaty if the Russians do not agree to the amendments we want, permitting multiple sites, unlimited interceptors, and

space-based sensors, and it would require the testing of a chemical laser in orbit in 1999, which would be a violation of the treaty.

I believe that we should develop and deploy a ground-based missile defense system. The gentleman referred to some of us who had voted for that before. I voted for it. Frankly, before that system is finished, I think we will want to deploy interceptors at more than one site. We will need to. I think we will also want to deploy space-based sensors, and I think that both of these features, plus more, will probably require changes and revisions in the ABM Treaty, but nothing requires us to negotiate those changes just now, right now.

If we force the administration to renegotiate the ABM Treaty now, with START II not yet ratified, we will risk the ratification of START II. And if START II is not ratified and our warheads are not reduced from 8,000 to around 3,500, and we have to maintain the deployment of nuclear weapons at START I levels, additional costs in operations and maintenance by the year 2000 are going to be \$5 to \$8 billion.

If we have to find these additional billions of dollars each year for offensive missile deployment and maintenance, where are we going to find the additional billions for defensive missile systems? Where will we find the billions needed to deploy missile interceptors and ground-based radars at multiple sites, to fast-track the space-based sensors, to field four theater ballistic missile systems at the same time?

One particular point. Dig deep into title II of this bill, research, deployment, and testing for the Air Force, and you will see where this bill simply does not ask the hard questions about where is the money going.

Here we say in this particular section that the Air Force should step up the deployment of so-called Brilliant Eyes or the Space and Missile Tracking System. We now plan on deploying one first operational shot in the year 2003. The cost estimated for that is \$5.5 billion, to do one operational shot in 2003. Of that cost, only \$800 million is now programmed in the Air Force's budget.

If we want to fast-track these space-based sensors so that all 18 satellites can be deployed in 2003, which is what title II calls for, that will mean billions of additional dollars in R&D over the next 7 years plus billions of additional dollars more to produce and launch 18 satellites, and the bill does not breathe a word about where this money is coming from.

That is why these provisions in this bill make for more of a political statement than a ballistic missile defense plan that can be paid for and carried out over the next 6 to 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, we need an authorization bill. We need it to provide additional pay for our troops. We need it to authorize military construction. We need it to authorize end-strength, we

need it for lots of reasons. But we can sustain this veto and still have a bill because I am convinced that in 1 week, 1 week of earnest work and reasonable compromise, we can bring forth a bill that the President will sign and almost all of us will vote for.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I only rise to respond briefly to the comments of the gentlewoman from Colorado, who I know always wants to be exactly correct in her comments. She made the comment that the President was really a strong supporter of national defense because he signed the defense appropriations bill.

In fact, in an interview with the Los Angeles Times, the President himself said that he signed the defense appropriations bill. But a message from the White House on November 30 indicates that the President did not sign the defense appropriations bill, that it became law without his signature, and I think that is one indication of just how strong the President does support national defense.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Readiness.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the military readiness Subcommittee and on behalf of U.S. forces and their families, I rise to strongly urge my colleagues to override the veto of the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization bill.

The conference report on H.R. 1530 achieves the goals that the Committee on National Security set to ensure that the readiness problems experienced late in 1994 would not be repeated. It provides the necessary resources to meet requirements. It establishes a mechanism to fund contingency operations so that funds are not diverted from critical readiness accounts. It institutes reforms in Defense support services to free resources for critical readiness and modernization programs.

With the deployment of United States forces to Bosnia as only the latest reminder of the commitment and sacrifice these men and women willingly make on a daily basis, it is critical that we keep faith with these men and women and demonstrate our commitment to ensure their welfare and that of their families. The conference report on H.R. 1530 does this. It ensures military readiness, improves quality of life for our military personnel and their families, and furthers the efficient use of Defense resources.

This bill takes concrete action in support of our forces. It deserves to be

enacted into law. Support our troops, override the veto.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the defense authorization bill and urge all Members to vote in favor of this veto override.

There are three simple reasons for my support. First, this bill provides tangible support for our troops deployed to Bosnia. This bill includes a 2.4-percent pay raise, important increases in housing allowances, and other support for our troops and their families.

Second, this bill makes an important commitment to defending this country and the American people against the growing threat of attack from ballistic missiles. The missile defense sections of this bill have been carefully coordinated with the administration and do not violate the ABM Treaty. Whatever my personal feelings about the ABM Treaty, any attempt to characterize this bill as a "dangerous violation" is simply to mislead the public and keep this Nation completely vulnerable to a growing and real threat.

Third, this bill keeps our promise to revitalize our national security within a balanced budget. We freeze the level of defense spending, slightly below 1995 levels. We will not allow the President to underfund even his own bottom-up review while continuing to use U.S. troops as the world's policemen.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to support our troops by supporting this bill and this override.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to, in the strongest possible terms, express that if Members want to vote to sustain the President's veto, do not buy the rhetoric that somehow we are doing this because it will in any way violate any treaty. This bill in no way violates any treaty to which this country is a party, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that.

What offends me most about this debate, listening from home, one would think that perhaps those on the other side do not support this bill, when in fact on the House floor 86 Democrats supported this bill, and when the President threatened to veto, 58 Democrats voted with us on this bill, because this is a good bill.

This does not violate the ABM Treaty in any way, shape, or form, and I will debate anyone at any time for any length of time on the detailed specifics that are debated here in 1-minute and 2-minute sound bites, and my colleagues know that.

And the talk about costly expenses to implement an ABM Treaty? The Air

Force has said they could do a system for \$2.5 billion in 4 years. The Army has said they could do one for \$4 billion in 5 years, and these figures were not contrived by some contractor. These were done in a special task force requested by Secretary Perry himself. Why do our colleagues not admit the facts as they are?

Then our colleagues get up and say that it is going to violate the START treaty. If our colleagues would read the Russian media on a daily basis, their concern is not about this bill and its impact on the ABM Treaty. Their concern is about this administration's plans with NATO. That is what is going to jeopardize START II in the minds of the Russians, not the ABM provisions in this bill.

But what really upsets me about my liberal colleagues and the President on this issue, Mr. Speaker, is they want to fund the world's first ABM system with United States tax dollars to protect the people of Israel. Because this country will do that with the Arrow system, and, by the way, I support that. My liberal friends will pay to protect the people of Israel but will not spend the money to protect the people of the United States. That is what is so outrageous.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in strong support of H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996. However, I am troubled to have to rise today for this purpose, not because of the numerous merits of the bill but because the President has chosen to veto legislation that supports military personnel and their families even while he has chosen to deploy those troops thousands of miles from home in a place called Bosnia.

It is rare for a President, any President, Mr. Speaker, to veto a defense bill. This President has already signed into law two appropriation bills for general defense and military construction. Yet here we are today debating whether to override a veto on the bill which specifies how these funds will be spent, and I have to ask why.

Let us look at the little part of the bill that I had the most responsibility for. On a bipartisan basis, the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, which I chair, has worked with the Department of Defense and with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations to develop a military construction program which makes significant improvements in our military infrastructure and enhance the quality of life for our service personnel and their families.

Over 9,200 families would benefit from new construction, as well as improvements to existing family housing

units. This bill would also provide for 68 new barracks projects.

In addition to those significant housing improvements, this bill would provide needed child development centers and medical facilities for our personnel. Hundreds of construction projects in this bill are designed to enhance the readiness of our forces, and the quality of life.

We know there is a military housing crisis. We have worked hard to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families. We are confronting a significant deterioration in military infrastructure. Without an authorization bill by law, none of these projects can go forward.

This legislation also provides for an important reform that, over the long term, will go a long way toward resolving the military housing crisis. Working closely with the Secretary of Defense, we have developed a program to encourage the private sector to develop troop housing and military family housing at installations where there is a certified shortage of quality housing—and we know that there are tens of thousands of such units in our present inventory. The housing crisis is deplorable and we must act to change it. Yet, the President has vetoed an initiative strongly supported by his own Secretary of Defense that can fix the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the President has chosen to put critical improvements that would begin to end years of benign neglect of our military infrastructure at risk. Why? As best I can tell it is because this President objects to a reasonable outcome on the question of ballistic missile defense. His view appears to be that if the threat is only realistically a decade away we should do nothing now to prepare for that possibility.

Most people I talk to are surprised—shocked—to learn that we have no defense against ballistic missile threats. The President should look to the future beyond his own term in office and help lay a foundation for a strong national defense in the next century. This bill does that. I urge a vote to override this ill-considered veto.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again rise in strong support of H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense authorization conference report. I am extremely disappointed that the President chose to veto this bill which represents the dedicated efforts of Chairman SPENCE and all the conferees to revitalize U.S. national security.

As I said on the House floor when we voted on the conference report last month, included in this conference report are provisions to significantly reform the procurement system of the Department of Defense and the civilian agencies of the Federal Government. These provisions are consistent with H.R. 1670, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995, which was a joint initiative of the Committee on Govern-

ment Reform and Oversight and the Committee on National Security. H.R. 1670 passed the House by a vote of 423 to 0 in September of last year.

The language in this conference agreement represents the efforts of many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers who have joined with us in rejecting the status quo, and who are prepared to lead the way toward reforming a system which, for years, has become increasingly more arcane, more convoluted, and therefore, more costly—both to government buyers and to businesses wanting to participate in the Federal marketplace.

The President supports these changes. The Statement of Administration Policy specifically pointed to these provisions as ones which are “beneficial.” It was disappointing that the President chose to overlook these provisions in making the decision to veto this conference report.

I would expect that the President believes that procurement reform legislation can be accomplished another way—and maybe it can. But the likelihood that free standing procurement legislation will be taken up by the Senate this year is remote and thus, it seems that the President has run the risk that important procurement reforms will not be enacted. By not taking advantage of this opportunity in the Defense authorization bill, he has endangered reforms which would free the Federal procurement system from continuing wasteful and costly procedures in a way that promotes affordable and commonsense approaches to meet our budgetary goals.

We in Congress have an opportunity today to override the President’s veto in order to see these significant reforms enacted into law. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense Authorization Conference Report.

□ 1515

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. Let me just respond to the distinguished gentleman, for whom I have a great deal of respect.

First, the President did not veto this bill on the procurement issue, and I would suggest that the gentleman totally and fully understand the legislative process that if we sustain the President’s veto, we can go back, address the issues of ballistic missile defense and ABM, the issues upon which the President vetoed the bill, correct those problems and come back to the floor with a conference report.

Nothing in the President’s message would throw out any of the legislation the gentleman responded to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado historically fails to see the solutions to very simple problems and requirements for

national security. We can neither accept nor tolerate anything less than a superlative force in our Armed Services. Someone with HIV positive, with the limited numbers of personnel we have, degrades from that readiness. We need a full up-round of that individual to serve, both either a man or woman, in our forces. We do not need the social engineering in a defense bill.

We voted 48 to 3 in the committee. How often in a committee do you vote 48 Republicans and Democrats to 3 to support a bill? Because it serves the needs of our men and women.

What are those needs? First of all, you have got to be able to train people so that they are going to survive in combat. You have got to be able to provide the weapons systems.

Do you know that the service life of our F-15 Strike Eagles over in Bosnia and the F-18 CD’s is almost gone? The replacement for F-16’s like Scott O’Grady, was shot down, and the helos in Iraq, there was no replacement?

The President’s budget, the military and Pentagon reacted to the President’s budget. That was not in there. We went and asked, “What do you need?” Not what do you want, “What do you need to do your job?” “We need replace those airplanes. We need the quality of care for our troops and those issues.” And we provided that. That is why we had a 48-to-3 vote within the committee.

I take a look at the Bottom-Up Review, where we are \$200 billion shy of the Bottom-Up Review, the ability to fight two conflicts at the same time. And, yes, we put some more money in because the Pentagon said, “This is what we need, a bare-bones minimum for readiness.”

What it is going to cost us, not \$2.2 billion but \$3 billion or \$6 billion to support Bosnia. Where do you think the President is going to want to take it from? Out of this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, over the last several months, President Clinton has picked up the veto pen frequently.

As of today, the President has rejected not only an overall plan to balance the budget, but also a number of other bills which would have put our Government employees back to work, opened our National Parks, and provided funds to fight crime and protect the environment.

The crowning blow, however, came last week, when he vetoed legislation authorizing the funds for our Nation’s defense at the very same time that United States troops were setting up their tents and sleeping bags in the snow of Bosnia.

In addition to laying out a plan to maintain our national security, this bill provides funds for desperately needed military housing improvements

and a very modest 2.4-percent pay raise for our military personnel. The President's veto sends the wrong message to our friends and allies; to our enemies; and—most especially—to our troops, and we should vote to override it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Columbia, TX [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 1530, the Defense authorization conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the President's goals in vetoing this essential piece of legislation.

It contains authorities that are absolutely necessary to maintain and train our Armed Forces.

For example, this Congress voted to protect the American people from ballistic missile attack.

What President would tell the citizens of this country that he does not want to protect them? This President, by his veto, said just that.

This Congress voted to keep American troops under American operational control.

What President would tell the Armed Forces of this country that he wanted them commanded by foreigners? This President, by his veto, said just that.

This Congress voted to support American military families with a small but well deserved pay raise, with basic protections for housing allowances, and improved health care. This President, believe it or not, vetoed that support.

This President vetoed the improvements in readiness that this Congress saw as essential. Among other things, we must have the mobilization insurance and dental care programs that H.R. 1530 will provide for our military reserve components. Through these and other programs, we must provide for our "citizen-soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines" to which this country has turned for over 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report contains too many important improvements for our Armed Forces than I can detail here. Suffice it to say that the President, by his veto, has made a grave mistake. It is no exaggeration to say that this President has made the world a more dangerous place to live by his veto.

It is the constitutional responsibility of this body to correct that mistake. Vote yes to override the President's veto.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond quickly to the statements made about the Arrow missile defense system in the well just a few minutes ago by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

That system is being funded in this budget at \$56.5 million in an account called Other Theater Ballistic Missile

Systems, which is totally funded at \$460 million. This \$56 million compares to about \$2 billion we are spending on upper-tier and lower-tier for the Navy, and Impact Three, and it is considered a theater ballistic missile defense system. It compares to \$770 million. None of it is for production, procurement and deployment. That issue is yet to be reached.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman answer for the record the total cost of the Arrow system, the total percentage of American dollars that will fund the first total, complete nationwide ABM system for a country in the world? Will the gentleman provide those for the record, the total cost, not this year, total cost?

Mr. SPRATT. Reclaiming my time, this is for a demonstration of the validity of the system. It is an R&D and development program. There is no money for deploying such a system. We have not reached that decision. We have not funded it.

Out of a total budget of \$3.8 billion, \$56 million for this; we fund it because we think there are complementarities and commonalities that will teach us something about our other systems.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, 1995 this House voted overwhelmingly in support of the conference report for the Military Construction Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996. By a bipartisan vote of 326 to 93 we demonstrated our commitment to addressing the serious housing and quality of life problems affecting our servicemembers and their families. On October 3, the President signed the appropriations bill, yet on December 28, the President vetoed the necessary authorization for the construction of badly needed new facilities.

Mr. Speaker, without this authorization, \$1 billion for construction and improvements for family housing cannot go forward. Secretary Perry's No. 1 priority for a family housing private sector initiative will remain stalled. And, \$626 million for desperately needed barracks; \$207 million for environmental compliance projects; \$430 million for Guard and Reserve operational facilities; \$196 million for medical related facilities; and, \$44 million for child development centers—none of these mentioned will be built.

In addition, while we have committed our troops to participate in IFOR, the \$161 million appropriated for the United States contribution to the NATO Security Investment Program cannot be obligated or expended. While our troops are supporting the Bosnia peacekeeping mission, the United States contribution for NATO communications and facility support for the same

mission is nonexistent without the enactment of this authorization.

Mr. Speaker, we have worked hard and in a bipartisan manner. The Appropriations and Authorization Committees have worked closely together to meet the needs of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and their families. Don't let our efforts disintegrate now. I urge you to join me in voting to override the veto of this much needed authorization.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, what we have is an appropriations bill not signed by the President that became law without his signature in search of an authorization bill.

If we care in this Chamber about adequate pay for the military, if we care in this Chamber for adequate housing for the military, if we care in this Chamber for adequate health for the military, if we care in this Chamber for our military retirees, if we care for adequate procurement reform within the Pentagon as a whole, then we will vote to override the President's veto.

This is long overdue. It is the House that historically has decided how much you authorize and you appropriate for the armed services of the United States. This has become an institutional matter. We should send a signal that the Government is open for business in terms of the Department of Defense, which needs these authorizations.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the missile defense portion of this thing a little bit.

Let me make it clear that when the negotiations were held with the chairman, the ranking member, a number of leaders from the other body, and the President's representative, he gave us a long laundry list of things he thought were wrong with the bill. When I asked him directly what he had to have out, what had to be taken out for the President to sign the bill, the answer I would characterize as evasive.

Now, we had a series of meetings with them. At least my feeling was, my impressive was, that if we took out one of the three basic elements of missile defense, that is, the multiple site designation, that the President would probably sign the bill. We took that out, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has risen up again and has given us a long litany of other things he thinks the President based his decision on.

Let me just say this: I think he has defined the issue fairly well. The President does not think it is in the interests of the United States of America to defend against incoming ballistic missiles. He feels we should not do that, because if we do that at some point we either have to renegotiate the ABM Treaty or we have to break it.

The problem is there are other countries besides the two countries that signed the ABM Treaty. We signed the ABM Treaty, the Russians signed it, and the North Koreans did not sign the ABM Treaty. They are building a missile which we project in a few years will have the ability of reaching some States in the United States of America.

We have no defense against that missile. Now, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has given us a good reason to continue to delay the building of a defense against ballistic missiles.

In 1991 we said we will have it by 1996. Today the majority, the Republicans, the American people said let us have it by at least 2003. No, that is not acceptable.

Maybe at some point, maybe at some point we will agree to defend the country by the year 2020. But the President has made it clear he does not want to defend America.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], to respond to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me make clear to my friend, as I think he knows, I am for building and deploying a ground-based system that is treaty-compliant to start with. I candidly acknowledge that before we are finished with it, we will probably want to go back to that treaty, change it significantly, so we can allow space-based sensors and multiple site deployment.

What I am saying now is if you push that issue, if you force it now, you are going to risk ratification of START-II. If START-II is not ratified, then ballistic missile defense against 8,000 warheads as opposed to 3,000 warheads is a much different thing.

I do not know where we are coming up with the money to maintain START-level offensive systems without, and at the same time to pay for, the development and deployment of a ballistic missile defense system. That is a coherent position.

I am for protecting ourselves against ballistic missiles that may be launched against this country.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Will the gentleman tell me when he is for completing this defense system?

Mr. SPRATT. As soon as practicable, and there is plenty of time between now and then to go back to the ABM Treaty once we have ratified START-II and to deal with the issues that we have to deal with, plenty of time to develop a system and then work out those issues.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

□ 1530

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I recently went to Bosnia to visit the area where

our troops will be located in Sarajevo and other places. I also stopped by in Germany to see the First Armor Division before they left. I went along with many others from this body, about 18 others who also visited with our troops.

Something very disturbing occurred to me while I was there. Many who support the policy of Bosnia do not support this authorization bill nor did they support the appropriations bill. I disagree with the policy in Bosnia. I cannot find anybody in my district who strongly supports it. Most of them say we should not be in there. But for us to go ahead and send troops there and then not support them through the authorization process, through the appropriation process is somehow fundamentally wrong.

With all respects to our President and his office, he did not sign the appropriations bill. He did not even have the courage to sign the appropriations bill. I think there is something fundamentally wrong there. He vetoed this authorization bill, which provides for our volunteer Army. I heard one comment over the time when we were contemplating sending troops in that this was the job of our military, that they had volunteered to do the job similar to Bosnia.

I believe that is above and beyond the call of what they agreed to when they took the oath as military personnel. They defend the Constitution, our borders, and our vital American interests overseas, but this is above and beyond that. There are no vital American interests in Bosnia that have been named or that have convinced the American people.

What is this fundamental difference? Why are we saying, yes, we will do this through the administration and send troops there but then not providing for the appropriations? Not providing for the authorization, there is a big fundamental difference here. I think that it may be possibly that someone is trying to embarrass our military. That cuts against everything that I believe this government stands for. It is evident in the Fourth District of Kansas. It is evident here on the floor of the House.

I believe that we should support this and override the veto. We should have had an appropriations bill that was signed by the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair wishes to inform the floor managers that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 1½ minutes remaining and is entitled to close, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, let me make a few observations. First, it is a very significant rule of the House that I believe is important, and it makes a great deal of sense. That is that none of us have the right to question each

other's motives. I think that is important. I think that allows us to be large in this body. It allows us to rise above mundane, earth bounding, pedestrian statements. It forces us to address the issues. I think we ought not be about questioning anyone's motives in this body, including the President of the United States.

I would suggest that it flies in the face of reality to suggest that anyone is attempting to embarrass the U.S. military. That is bizarre and extreme in its orientation, and it defies response except to suggest that it is totally disingenuous and it ought to be beyond us.

Second, all of us know why the appropriations bill was not signed into law. If we recall, the President of the United States initially said that he would veto the appropriations bill on the grounds that increasing the military budget by \$7 billion at a time when we were cutting education for our children, challenging Medicare and doing other kinds of things in the totality of the budget debate was unacceptable. But then along came the issue of Bosnia, and a number of my colleagues challenged the President on the issue of Bosnia and said, you ought to take a second look at whether you veto the appropriation bill.

So the President was caught between vetoing on the integrity of the budget and the stress on the issue of deploying of troops in Bosnia, stepped back, allowed the bill to become law without signature. I do not think we ought to question that as, in some kind of way, unAmerican, unpatriotic or noncourageous or suggesting that anyone wanted to embarrass the military in this country. That is extreme and we ought to stay with reality.

Second, let me make this observation for those who raised the brilliant parts of the bill regarding family housing, et cetera: No. 1, we all understand the legislative process. We can bring the MILCON bill to the floor of Congress in a separate piece of legislation. For those of my colleagues who raised the issue of acquisition reform, they understand the legislative process. They know they can bring acquisition to the floor of Congress in a separate piece of legislation. For those who raised the issue of the cost-of-living increases for military troops, they can bring that bill to the floor of Congress in a separate piece of legislation.

I would also remind my colleagues that, just before we left to go home for the few days of the Christmas break, during that week we had four separate opportunities in the context of the debate on the issue of the continuing resolution of whether we would pass a continuing resolution that would provide for the cost of living for the troops, four times. So it is a little disingenuous to bring the issue in the context of a veto message suggesting that this is the only way that we can deal with the cost of living of the troops.

This gentleman has been around here 25 years. It seems to me that the one

thing we ought to be about is dealing with each other with a degree of honesty and integrity that is warranted by our significant responsibilities here. It seems to me that all of us have a responsibility to be part of the educative process.

Finally, I would make this observation, Mr. Speaker. The President did not veto the bill on the basis of all these good things. He vetoed the bill on the basis of the bad things. One of the bad things was that it does indeed have the potential of abrogating the ABM treaty.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said nothing can be further from the truth. But the ABM treaty only allows one site on either side. If you move to multiple sites, if you move to a multiple site, there is violation. But I would grant that in this particular bill the language has been fuzzed up so that it speaks to protection of the continental image of the United States. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will, I am sure, agree that, at a bare minimum, it is debatable that you can do that without multiple sites. The gentleman understands that. There have been no hearings on this basis.

So what is in the record is the potential for abrogation. That is what I am suggesting, potential for abrogation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, a man who knows something about representing this country abroad, having served in prisoner of war camps in Vietnam.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hate this disagreement among us. I respect the Democrats, and I respect the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] very much. I think he knows exactly what he is doing. But in the last 10 years, he is aware that the defense budget has been cut by 71 percent. It has hit us hard.

This particular authorization takes care of our troops. It gives them equipment that they need in order to fight the battle. It gives them the stuff of what it takes for this President to expand our military all over the world with new missions and lets them do the job. It gives them the ability to do the job. In addition it gives them that quality of life that gets them out of the snow and mud and makes the military worth being in and worth fighting for this nation.

I urge Members to support this and override that presidential veto and give our troops what they need. We do not want the President trying to do more with less. I think the gentleman would agree with that.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania as end was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, let us call it like it is.

This President does not want a defense bill. He only signed the appro-

priations bill and allowed it to become law to get support for the funding of troops in Bosnia. He never wanted this bill. Did we try?

Mr. Speaker, I was in meetings with Senator NUNN and Bob Bell, the Assistant to the President for National Security, for one entire day on missile defense. Mr. Bell raised 12 specific points. I will put in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we resolved all 12 points to his satisfaction. Senator NUNN raised four points, Mr. Speaker, and we resolved all four points to Senator NUNN's satisfaction.

Mr. Speaker, in the end this President does not want a bill because this President does not support our military. I urge an override of the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

NET RESULT OF CHANGES MADE TO ACCOMMODATE THE MINORITY AND THE WHITE HOUSE

(1) Virtually all the complaints lodged against the BMD provisions in the SASC-reported (prior to the compromise) and House-passed bills related to the ABM Treaty and the President's prerogatives in the area of arms control negotiations. All of these concerns have been eliminated by the conference action. Two areas, in particular, have been fixed:

In dropping the House demarcation language and adopting language virtually identical to the Senate-passed language, the conference report will not constrain the President's right to negotiate and will not impose a unilateral interpretation of the treaty.

In eliminating the requirement to deploy a multiple-site NMD system, we eliminate the argument that the bill contains an "anticipatory breach" of the ABM Treaty. The requirement to deploy an NMD system by a date certain is not a treaty issue since we are permitted to deploy a single site under the treaty. Therefore, concern that this will upset the Russians and START II should be eliminated. After all, the only operational ABM system in the world is around Moscow.

(2) The other argument or concern that has been raised is that the Senate-passed language is particularly important since it was carefully negotiated, agreed to by a large majority in the Senate, and is acceptable to the Administration. The fact of the matter is that the conference action incorporates an overwhelming majority of the Senate compromise.

The structure of the conference agreement is virtually identical to the Senate-passed bill. One section (cruise missile defense) was split off as a free-standing provision and one non-controversial section (cooperation with allies) was added.

Although there have been changes made to the Senate-passed language, there is more identical than different. With the exception of the three NMD variables (deploy, multi-site, and date), which have been negotiated with the Minority and the White House, the underlying structure and content is overwhelmingly the Senate language.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the record the following remarks regarding Bill Clinton's veto of this defense authorization conference report. I spent this past New Year's weekend with our troops and their families in Germany as they prepared for deployment into Bosnia. This defense bill including pay raises, increased housing allowances, vital weapons modernization, and new combat readiness priorities, is exactly what these sol-

diers and their families want—it is exactly what they need. Please support this conference report and please support an override of the Clinton veto—a veto against our troops deploying to Bosnia!

CONGRESSMAN ROBERT K. DORNAN REBUKES

CLINTON FOR VETO OF DEFENSE BILL

"It's absolutely absurd for Bill Clinton to send our troops into civil war in Bosnia and then veto a defense authorization bill which provides them and their families so much support," commented Congressman Robert K. Dornan of California who, as the chairman of the House National Security Subcommittee on Military Personnel, was one of the prime authors of the FY 1996 defense bill which the president rejected yesterday.

"General Omar Bradley once said that 'Fairness, diligence, sound preparation, professional skill and loyalty are the marks of American military leadership.' Where's your fairness; where's your loyalty, Mr. President?"

Dornan firmly believes this defense bill contains exactly what the troops and their families scheduled for deployment to Bosnia need. Among the provisions in the bill Dornan helped develop and pass include a modest 2.4 percent military pay raise, a 5.2 percent increase in the basic allowance for quarters/housing, and new guidelines for accountability of American POWs and MIAs. Dornan, who introduced the first and only free standing legislation to restore the pay raise two years ago, had harsh words for the President. "After twice canceling a modest pay raise for our military, a raise that was twice restored by the U.S. Congress, Clinton now is attempting to gain credit for this raise by separating it from the rest of the defense bill. The troops already were expecting this raise! Other real benefits, such as the additional housing funding and POW/MIA legislation, are being held hostage to cheap liberal politics!"

In his veto statement, Clinton described his objections to three major provisions of the bill. All three provisions were major initiatives by Congressman Dornan. "Clinton objects to immediately deploying an effective ballistic missile defense, despite the fact that we Republicans have identified a near term/low cost system known as 'upper tier' which would modify existing Navy ships and missiles for wide area missile defense. Clinton objects to my limitations on placing U.S. troops under foreign and U.N. command, even though this is precisely the reason why he cost 19 Americans their lives in Somalia. Finally, Clinton objects to restrictions on U.S. defense funding going to Russia, including my provision to restrict some aid pending an end to Russian work on offensive biological weapons. It's obvious 'Peacenik Clinton' is more interested in supporting Third World dictators with missiles, the United Nations, and communists in Russia than supporting the United States military and the United States taxpayer!"

THE FISCAL YEAR 1996 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

Republicans Restore Defense Spending After Clinton Cuts Combat Readiness

President Bill Clinton has more than doubled the defense cuts promised by Candidate Clinton—\$120 billion!

Clinton's defense plan—the "Bottom Up Review"—should be called the "Bottom Out Plan"—it's underfunded by as much as \$150 billion!

Republicans, under the leadership of Floyd Spence, have restored just \$7 billion to defense, including programs I personally helped initiate such as: additional funding for Army "scout" helicopters—both the OH-58D "Kiowa Warrior" and RAH-66 "Comanche", additional funding to build "more"

than 20 B-2 bombers and equip the B-1B with precision guided munitions, and additional funding for a near term ballistic missile defense capability using existing Navy Aegis cruisers and destroyers.

My Subcommittee on Personnel, thanks to the efforts of my ranking Democrat Owen Pickett and the hard work of all my subcommittee members, improved military quality of life by: increasing military housing allowance by 35 percent, setting permanent personnel levels to stop the "drawdown," and increasing the number of national guard technicians.

I also included several initiatives that reverse the trend of liberal social programs within the department designed to conduct combat operations.

This bill: stops abortions at U.S. military hospitals, stops pay for convicted military prisoners, establishes strict new guidelines for the accountability of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, discharges all non-deployable HIV+ military personnel, and awards the AFEM to U.S. veterans of El Salvador.

In closing, I would remind those who oppose this bill of the wise words of one of our founding fathers, Benjamin Franklin, who warned:

The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it.

Support our troops, support modernization, support this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution, the vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 156, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—240

Allard	Castle	English
Archer	Chambliss	Ensign
Army	Chenoweth	Everett
Bachus	Christensen	Ewing
Baesler	Chrysler	Fawell
Baker (CA)	Clement	Flanagan
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Foley
Ballenger	Coble	Forbes
Barr	Coburn	Fowler
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)	Fox
Bartlett	Combust	Franks (CT)
Barton	Cooley	Frelinghuysen
Bass	Costello	Frisa
Bateman	Cox	Frost
Bereuter	Cramer	Funderburk
Bevill	Crane	Gekas
Bilbray	Crapo	Geren
Bilirakis	Cremeans	Gilchrest
Bishop	Cubin	Gillmor
Bliley	Cunningham	Gilman
Boehlert	Danner	Gingrich
Boehner	Davis	Goodlatte
Bonilla	de la Garza	Goodling
Bono	Deal	Goss
Brewster	DeLay	Graham
Browder	Diaz-Balart	Greenwood
Brownback	Dickey	Hall (OH)
Bryant (TN)	Doolittle	Hall (TX)
Bunn	Dornan	Hamilton
Bunning	Dreier	Hancock
Burr	Duncan	Hansen
Burton	Dunn	Harman
Buyer	Edwards	Hastert
Calvert	Ehlers	Hastings (WA)
Campbell	Ehrlich	Hayes
Canady	Emerson	Hayworth

Hefley	McNulty	Seastrand
Heineman	Metcalf	Sensenbrenner
Heger	Meyers	Shadegg
Hilleary	Mica	Shaw
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Sisisky
Hoekstra	Molinari	Skeen
Horn	Montgomery	Skelton
Hostettler	Moorhead	Smith (MI)
Houghton	Myers	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Nethercutt	Smith (WA)
Inglis	Neumann	Solomon
Istook	Ney	Spence
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Stearns
Johnson, Sam	Ortiz	Stenholm
Jones	Oxley	Stump
Kasich	Packard	Talent
Kelly	Parker	Tate
Kennedy (RI)	Paxon	Tauzin
Kennelly	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Kim	Petri	Taylor (NC)
King	Pickett	Tejeda
Kingston	Pombo	Thomas
Knollenberg	Porter	Thornberry
Kolbe	Portman	Tiaht
LaHood	Poshard	Torkildsen
Largent	Pryce	Traficant
Latham	Quinn	Vucanovich
Laughlin	Radanovich	Waldholtz
Lazio	Regula	Walker
Leach	Riggs	Walsh
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	Ward
Linder	Rohrabacher	Watts (OK)
Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (FL)
Livingston	Roth	Weldon (PA)
Longley	Royce	Weller
Lucas	Salmon	White
Manzullo	Sanford	Whitfield
McCrery	Saxton	Wicker
McDade	Scarborough	Wolf
McHugh	Schaefer	Young (AK)
McIntosh	Schiff	Young (FL)
McKeon	Scott	Zeliff

NAYS—156

Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Andrews	Hefner	Oberstar
Baldacci	Hilliard	Obey
Barcia	Hinchey	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Holden	Orton
Becerra	Hoyer	Owens
Beilenson	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Bentsen	Jackson-Lee	Payne (NJ)
Blute	(TX)	Peterson (FL)
Bonior	Jacobs	Peterson (MN)
Borski	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Boucher	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Camp	Johnston	Rangel
Cardin	Kanjorski	Reed
Chabot	Kaptur	Richardson
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Clyburn	Kildee	Roemer
Coleman	Klecicka	Rose
Collins (IL)	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Collins (MI)	Klug	Rush
Condit	LaFalce	Sabo
Conyers	Lantos	Sanders
Coyne	Levin	Schroeder
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Dellums	Lincoln	Serrano
Deutsch	LoBiondo	Shays
Dicks	Lofgren	Skaggs
Dingell	Lowey	Slaughter
Doggett	Luther	Spratt
Dooley	Maloney	Stokes
Doyle	Manton	Stupak
Engel	Markey	Thompson
Eshoo	Martinez	Thornton
Evans	Martini	Thurman
Farr	Mascara	Torres
Fattah	Matsui	Torricelli
Fields (LA)	McCarthy	Towns
Filner	McDermott	Upton
Flake	McHale	Velazquez
Ford	McInnis	Vento
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Volkmer
Franks (NJ)	Meehan	Waters
Furse	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Ganske	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Gejdenson	Minge	Williams
Gephardt	Mink	Wise
Gonzalez	Moakley	Woolsey
Gordon	Mollohan	Wynn
Green	Moran	Yates
Gunderson	Morella	Zimmer
Gutierrez	Murtha	
Gutknecht	Nadler	

NOT VOTING—38

Abercrombie	Foglietta	Quillen
Berman	Gallegly	Roukema
Brown (FL)	Gibbons	Sawyer
Brown (OH)	Hoke	Shuster
Bryant (TX)	Hutchinson	Souder
Callahan	LaTourette	Stark
Chapman	Lightfoot	Stockman
Clay	McCollum	Studds
DeFazio	Meek	Tanner
Dixon	Mfume	Visclosky
Durbin	Norwood	Wilson
Fazio	Pastor	Wyden
Fields (TX)	Pelosi	

□ 1545

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Abercrombie and Mr. Hoke for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Mr. Quillen and Mr. Lightfoot for, with Mr. Pastor against.

Messrs. BAESLER, ROHRBACHER, and DE LA GARZA changed their vote from "nay" to "yea".

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The message and bill are referred to the Committee on National Security.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately enroute to Washington when three roll-call votes were ordered. Had I been present, I would have voted "present" on rollcall No. 1, "no" on rollcall No. 2, and "no" on rollcall No. 3.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1530.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR ROMANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 19, 1995, I determined and reported to the Congress that Romania is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Romania and certain other activities without the requirement of an annual waiver.