

He is absolutely right. Do not take the full faith and credit of this Nation hostage for ideological wars. This is absolutely ridiculous. It has never been done in the history of this Republic. I think the people are fed up with our, A, shutting down the Government and, B, now talking about that as not enough, we will push the credit off the cliff.

That would not be tolerated by our forefathers and foremothers, and the American people have run out of their toleration with it. I hope this body listened last night.

#### REFLECTION ON THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I too was gratified by much of what I heard last night. But as I looked around the Chamber, I saw several of my colleagues look much younger. It was the same speech that we heard throughout the 1992 campaign: Ending welfare as we know it; balancing the budget; reducing the size and scope of Government.

The fascinating thing for us to do was to juxtapose the speech in 1992 that was given by the President through his campaign and then look at the State of the Union Messages that we have gotten before. In 1993, we heard about the importance of increasing taxes on the middle class. We got that in 1993, the largest tax increase ever.

Then I will never forget seeing the President deliver his State of the Union Message in this Chamber, and he held up a card. That card was going to be designed to ensure that every American was part of a national health care system, a program that would usurp one-seventh of our entire economy into a package like that.

The speech last night got back to the basis of that 1992 campaign. I hope very much that during this 2d session of the 104th Congress, we will be able to govern just the way he talked.

#### A GREAT STATE OF THE UNION

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last night, in his State of the Union Address, President Clinton spoke about the "age of possibility." He focused on the real issues affecting our Nation's families. Perhaps most importantly, the President extended his hand to the Republican majority and asked them to work with him, to lay down partisanship, to build a better America.

Yes, President Clinton's budget has created almost 8 million new jobs in the last 3 years and the lowest combined rate of unemployment and inflation rate since the 1960's. Yes, the Clinton budget has cut the deficit in half.

And yes, the crime rate, the poverty rate, and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. But, President Clinton knows there is still more to be done.

President Clinton has offered a balanced budget which protects the Democratic priorities of Medicare and Medicaid, education, and the environment.

Last night, President Clinton asked the Republicans to join him to help build a better America. I hope they will heed his call.

#### NO DEFAULT

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last evening President Clinton held out an olive branch to all of the people of this country to say it is time to heal the fractures which have divided us as Americans.

I reached out some years ago to Republicans to say that we ought to have a balanced budget in this country. I was delighted to see that we got to a point where Democrats and Republicans agree on the fact that we need to balance the budget.

We have very different ideas about how to get that budget in balance. But that does not mean that either party has the right to drive this country for the first time not only into debt but to drive it to a point where we default on our obligations that have been made by generations before us.

I ask the Republicans and Democrats to come up here to this desk and to sign a discharge petition to make certain that we have a clean debt ceiling provided for the people of this country. People have fought and died for the United States of America, for our Bill of Rights, for what this country stands for. Let us not think we are so important that we have the right to turn our backs on what this country has stood for for 250 years. Let us sign a clean discharge petition.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1124, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 340 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 340

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 340 is a rule providing for the consideration of the conference reports to accompany S. 1124, the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization bill.

The rule waives points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and was reported out of the Committee on Rules by a unanimous voice vote.

As Members will recall, Mr. Speaker, the previous Defense authorization bill was vetoed by the President. In his veto message the President cited a handful of objections. We believe they have been accommodated in this legislation and, thus, it is hoped that the President will, therefore, now sign this bill.

It would be ultimately shortsighted and inexcusably reckless, Mr. Speaker, to underestimate the national security dangers that face the United States. Yes, the Soviet Union collapsed, but Russia remains engaged in serious internal struggles that will decide its future course of behavior in the world community. China is acquiring wealth at an extraordinary rate. Some project that it may surpass the United States in gross domestic product by early in the next century. And with wealth inevitably comes vast military power.

North Korea. Though the Clinton administration is providing massive amounts of oil and technical assistance to North Korea, that regime remains an enemy of the United States. The regime in Tehran is a deadly enemy of the United States, Mr. Speaker, with enormous oil reserves. And there remain many other enemies of this great Nation throughout the world.

There are many who would love to see the United States on its knees, our youth destroyed by drugs, our economy shattered by debt. Here in this hemisphere the regime in Havana, Mr. Speaker, is one such implacable enemy of the American people, though many in this city and even in this House do not see it that way.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] by the way, for supporting consistently strong sanctions against that regime, like we are now in this Congress trying to do against the regime in Tehran as well.

The Cuban dictator has a network of terrorists and drug traffickers at his command throughout this hemisphere, in Colombia, in Peru and Bolivia, in

Guatemala. In Mexico, we all know the subcommander Marcos in Chiapas in Mexico, he is subcommander so as to not offend his commander, Castro. In Venezuela the Cuban regime maintains very close ties with Colonel Chavez who attempted a coup d'etat in recent years and remains intent on doing so again. There is no doubt nevertheless that the Cuban dictator at this point is bankrupt. But if he survives, Mr. Speaker, 2 or 3 more years, the pendulum toward the neoliberal or conservative governments throughout this hemisphere that has characterized the last decade, that pendulum may very well swing the other direction toward statism. And if that happens and if the Cuban dictator is able to obtain the international credits that he is so desperately seeking and that some in this House are supporting, he would no longer be a bankrupt tyrant with a network of terrorists and drug traffickers throughout this hemisphere but, rather, a tyrant with economic means and a network of terrorists and drug traffickers throughout this hemisphere.

That would constitute a major threat not only to all the governments of this hemisphere that are now curiously enough appeasing that dictator in the hope that he will be nice to them but also a major threat even to the national security of the United States.

I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that this administration would be capable of seeing that reality instead of opposing sanctions against Castro and sending emissaries to meet with the dictator to work out a little secret deal with him. But irrespective of that, Mr. Speaker, we need a strong national defense. And this bill, despite the changes that we have had to make to it, I believe is a necessary ingredient in a strong posture for the United States of America.

I would like to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], ranking member, along with the dedicated staff of the entire Committee on National Security and its membership for their efforts in bringing forth this second defense authorization.

This renegotiated conference report achieves many important goals, including improving the quality of life for military personnel and reforming the Federal procurement system.

Mr. Speaker, I support both this rule and the conference report. I would urge adoption of the rule.

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

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

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the conference report.

Every Member understands that it is necessary that the House consider this conference report because the first

DOD conference report was vetoed by the President and the Congress was unable to override.

I commend the Committee on National Security for coming forward with this new conference agreement which addresses several of the President's strongest objections. While there are still provisions of the agreement which are objectionable to the administration, I believe the removal of three provisions, language relating to the establishment of a national missile defense system, the President's ability to deploy U.S. troops in peace-keeping operations and the requirement that the President submit supplemental funding requests for contingency operations will allow the President to sign this bill into law.

I congratulate the conferees for their spirit of compromise and their willingness to do what is necessary to ensure that the other critical programs and projects in this bill become law.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference agreement because it like its predecessor makes available funding for the B-2 stealth bomber. The B-2 is an important component of our overall defense system and I commend the conferees for their continued steadfast support of this program.

In addition, I am especially gratified that the conference agreement contains initiatives to accelerate high priority quality-of-life projects for the men and women of our armed forces and their families.

□ 1300

These projects are every bit as important to our defense system as are the many weapons systems found in the bill. And the conference report also ensures that readiness remains a top funding priority. Again the conferees have provided us with an excellent bill, and I urge every Member to support it.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, is a non-controversial rule. It provides for the expedited consideration of this conference report in a manner that is accepted practice and custom in the House of Representatives. However, I am very concerned that my Republican colleagues have begun a new practice that is contrary to the accepted practice and custom of the House. That new practice, which we have seen in other rules brought to the floor in recent weeks, has the effect of denying the minority the rights they are assured by the rules of this body.

My Democratic colleagues on the Committee on Rules protested this new practice earlier this month when we met to consider three continuing appropriations, and the Republican majority reported rules which not only closed the continuing resolutions to amendment but also denied the minority their guaranteed right to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I include a letter signed by the four Democrats on the Committee on Rules to Chairman SOLOMON at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES,  
Washington, DC, January 23, 1996.

Hon. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules, Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While in the minority, you and your Republican colleagues staunchly defended the minority's right to offer a motion to recommit. On the first day of the 104th Congress, the Republican majority made good on its promise to expand that right. But it seems we've come a long way since those days.

Exactly one year and a day after adopting the opening day rules change to guarantee the minority's right to offer an expanded motion, the Republican majority found a way to break its commitment to protect even the simple motion to recommit.

On Friday, January 5, 1996, the Republican majority used a transparent parliamentary ploy—not once, not twice, but three times—to circumvent the rule assuring the minority a motion to recommit. Clause 4(b) of rule XI, first adopted in 1909, prohibits the Rules Committee from reporting a resolution that prevents the minority from offering a motion to recommit. Specifically, clause 4(b) prohibits the Rules Committee from reporting a rule that “would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 4 of rule XVI” and clause 4 of rule XVI states that the motion to recommit will be in order “after the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution.”

On that day, the Republican majority in the House approved three extraordinarily restrictive rules providing for initial consideration of three new approaches to continuing appropriations. Ordinarily, a new bill or joint resolution would be introduced providing continuing appropriations. Instead, the House considered House amendments to Senate amendments to unrelated House bills. In one particularly egregious case, the rule hijacked a Senate amendment to a House bill dealing with the National Marine Fisheries Service lab to attach a continuing appropriation. The obvious and intended effect in all three cases was to circumvent the prohibition against the Committee on Rules reporting a rule that prevents a motion to recommit on initial consideration of a new idea.

We are writing to protest the manner in which these items were considered. We are writing to protest the outrageous and arrogant stifling of debate and alternative approaches.

The first rule, House Resolution 334, provided for consideration in the House of an unusual continuing appropriation amendment to a Senate clean and simple CR amendment to an unrelated bill, H.R. 1643, extending most-favored-nation duty status for products from Bulgaria. Before this Congress, the House would have ignored the Senate amendment to H.R. 1643. The Senate amendment initiated continuing appropriations. The House—until this time—has guarded its prerogative to initiate appropriations, blueslipping Senate appropriation bills and simply not taking up Senate amendments to House bills where such amendments initiated appropriation measures. By taking up H.R. 1643 with the Senate amendment, the House has now signaled its acceptance of the Senate infringement on the custom and privilege of the House to initiate spending.

The next two rules, House Resolutions 336 and 338, went a step further. Not satisfied with blocking all amendments including the motion to recommit, the GOP majority denied any separate debate on the House amendment. Adoption of the rule constituted adoption of the House amendment. Once the

House passed the rule, the whole matter was automatically sent to the Senate without further debate or votes.

Making the vote on the rule also the vote on the policy precludes any serious discussion of the process. The seriousness of the issues involved—continuing appropriations and the threat of another costly government shutdown—overwhelmed any debate about the motion to recommit. If any fair-minded Republicans wanted to protest this rule (and its repudiation of the Republican expansion of the motion to recommit) they could not do so without fear of contradicting the Speaker's policy on continuing appropriations. The Republican freshmen have learned the Speaker's vengeance on such matters will be swift and direct.

We were surprised that you would agree to a procedure that diminishes the traditions and prerogatives of the House and tramples on the minority rights you championed for so long when you were in the minority. We are deeply disappointed that the Rules Committee under your chairmanship would participate in this unseemly circumvention of clause 4(b) of rule XI and we hope that such actions will not be repeated.

Sincerely,

JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY.  
MARTIN FROST.  
ANTHONY BEILENSON.  
TONY HALL.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, in this letter my colleagues and I protest what we consider to be outrageous and arrogant stifling of debate and express our hope that these actions will not be repeated. I believe our position is meritorious and supports the best interests of the House of Representatives as a constitutional institution. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this letter should be made a part of the permanent record.

Mr. Speaker, I found it quite interesting that no Republican Member defended the minority's right to offer the motion to recommit earlier this month. I found it very sad that a party that has so strongly and so correctly defended the rights of the minority now practices a brand of political gamesmanship that stifles all debate and dissent.

I bring this subject to the attention of the House because the Committee on Rules is scheduled to meet today to consider another continuing resolution. I hope that my Republican colleagues will not perpetuate this practice and will allow the House an opportunity to debate the issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule. I support this rule because it is fair and because it provide for the consideration of important programs of the Department of Defense. But I hope that when we meet in the future to consider rules reported by the Republican majority of the Committee on Rules that the rights of the minority are protected and assured.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my chairman and leader of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his

remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would rise in support of this rule. I would urge its adoption so that we can get on with the debate and passage of this long-awaited essential legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD my response to my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON RULES,

Washington, DC, January 24, 1996.

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,  
Ranking Minority Member, House Committee on  
Rules, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOE: Thank you for your letter of January 23rd cosigned by your minority committee colleagues expressing concerns over three recent rules providing for the disposition of Senate amendments to House bills and the fact that these rules denied the minority a motion to recommit.

As you know, the guarantee of a motion to recommit with instructions was one of the House Rules reforms that we adopted on the opening day of this Congress because it was something we felt strongly about when it was denied to us on numerous occasions when we were in the minority. However, as you are also aware, the guarantee only applies to rules that provide for the consideration of bills and joint resolutions, and does not apply to simple or concurrent resolutions, or to motions to dispose of amendments.

The three rules to which you refer all involved emergency spending measures that were considered just prior to our recess earlier this month. All three measures enjoyed widespread, bipartisan support given the need to reopen the government.

However, I fully understand your concern that this procedure could be abused in the future as a way to deny the minority a motion to recommit with instructions. As probably the leading champion of that right when we were in the minority I can assure you that I will continue to safeguard that right, just as I insisted that we enshrine this guarantee in our House Rules when we came into the majority. I have therefore transmitted a copy of your letter to the Majority Leader and other members of our leadership, together with my views that the procedure for disposing of Senate amendments should only be used where circumstances clearly warrant it.

Sincerely,

GERALD B. SOLOMON,

Chairman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I do believe the gentleman protests too much. No rules of the House have been waived. We have followed procedure, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the gentleman sitting next to me that is managing this rule, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Miami, FL, he and his family have for so many years been a bulwark of defense against the spread of international, deadly, atheistic communism throughout the world but especially in the Western Hemisphere, in Cuba and Central America. I want to commend him for his outstanding effort on behalf of himself and his family.

Once again, I would like to commend Chairman SPENCE and his outstanding

staff for the tireless work they have put in on this bill, especially during the very long conference period. Chairman SPENCE and his very, very able staff are among the very best in this entire House. They put in yeoman hours on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, we must pass this legislation today and the President must sign this bill into law. This authorization bill is the first step in restoring our defenses to the level that should be in place for the world's only superpower today. We all know that the defense budget has endured 10 years of cuts, 10 years in a row. This must stop and this bill stops it dead in its tracks. That is why I support the legislation.

Furthermore, the bill helps to improve the lives of our men and women that serve in the armed forces of the United States, with increases in pay, with basic housing allowance increases, with health care provisions, and many other items that help make a better life for these young men and women and their families that serve in the military today.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important bill in our annual process than the defense authorization bill. After all, that is why we have a republic of States. It is for the primary purpose of providing for a national defense for these States of ours, and this year's bill is critical if America is to maintain its leadership role in the world, as I think it should. And as our young men and women serve in Bosnia, we must give them all the support we can even though many of us oppose the policy that put them there. This bill is a start towards that.

Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the President would sign this bill, many of us have had to compromise over several important issues. But in Ronald Reagan's words, he used to say to me, "JERRY, politics is the art of compromise. You cannot always have it your own way." And certainly this is a proof positive that we are bending over backwards to try to cooperate.

The reason I am supporting this bill is because we have a level of funding that is going to help restore the defenses of this Nation, and that is the only reason, because I really do object to several of the provisions that have been compromised in it. But I would urge every Member to come over here today, to vote for this rule and then vote for this very vital piece of legislation.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], for his generosity and courtesy in yielding me the time. I rise very much in support of this rule. After careful consideration and looking at the legislation, I support that as well.

I think it is important in the spirit of cooperation, unity, and togetherness when we have the opportunity to move forward, that we do that, and I think this fills that role. This is a very important piece of legislation.

There are three issues that are at stake today. One is the question of our missile defense national security; that is a subject we are going to give considerable more attention to. The other is the question of the U.N. chain of command; that is in the newspapers today. That is a subject we are going to be hearing more about and talking about on the floor.

Another is the cost of peacekeeping that the President alluded to last night. That is an area we have to focus great attention on, because adventures, or perhaps misadventures as we have had in places like Haiti, have an extraordinary cost to them. We are up in the range of about \$3 billion now on that, and we do not have any way to really address those kinds of issues—\$3 billion here, \$3 billion there for what is loosely called “peacekeeping” or “peacemaking” suddenly adds up to some serious money and is a big issue in the question of how we do our national defense and our national security.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, who was wounded and imprisoned by enemies of this Nation while he fought to defend our Nation and our people.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our Armed Forces.

Although there are many good things in this bill, changes made in this latest version are not in our Nation's best interests. The most egregious omission is that it now allows the President to put American troops under U.N. command.

Under U.N. control the world's best fighting force would be put into the hands of an irresponsible, incompetent organization that is fraught with unnecessary bureaucracy and fiscal crises.

The United Nations record is a disgrace. Peacekeeping missions continue to grow in number, while success declines and its purposes and goals are ill-defined at best. There is no leadership.

Our service men and women put their lives on the line to protect freedom and serve our Nation. It is our responsibility to ensure their safety. We would be shirking that responsibility by allowing someone from the United Nations—who knows nothing about the U.S. military—to assume control of our troops.

Once again I find myself wondering why this administration and those on the other side of the aisle have fought so hard against any effort to protect our troops from being placed under U.N. control.

How can any American really be committed to any questionable organi-

zation such as the United Nations. I am amazed that any administration could have such little concern for our Nation's military. I would hope that the decision to take this important provision out of this bill will be reconsidered in the future. The safety and future of our Armed Forces depend upon it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], a great American patriot who we are honored to have serve in this Chamber.

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, this cannot be a happy day for big-taxing and big-spending politicians. Here is the New York Times. It says, “Clinton Offers Challenge to Nation, Declaring Era of Big Government Is Over.” That on the Gray Lady, America's so-called paper of record, is amazing.

Here is the great Washington Times, “Clinton Concedes End of Big Government Era.”

And here is the Washington Post, the alleged paper of record inside the beltway. “Clinton Embraces GOP Themes in Setting Agenda.” The era of big Government is over.

As I said in a 1-minute speech this morning, Mr. Clinton did what he did in all of the State of the Union speeches, tearing pages from Ronald Reagan's book, put heroes in the gallery, military heroes, a year-ago Medal of Honor winners who, one gentleman won a Medal of Honor 7 days after his 17th birthday on the sands and ground-up lava of Iwo Jima. Last night he had sitting in the front row here, General Barry McCaffrey, who when he was a lieutenant and a young captain in Vietnam, Clinton could not gag out the word “Vietnam,” won three Purple Hearts.

He was the general who in the White House 2 years and 10 months ago was told, “We don't speak to people in uniform here.” They did not know he was the commander of the 24th Infantry Division Mechanized, the point of the spear, the Hail-Mary left hook that broke through into Iraq and around Kuwait and liberated that poor besieged nation.

Pointing to heroes and then taking away their pay raises and their benefits is not going to work with the American people.

As I look at my Clinton countdown watch today, I see it is 362 days to the inauguration of the 43d President of the United States, a brandnew one; and subtracting the 76 days from the election to the inauguration, that means in 286 days, Mr. Clinton is going to be asked to account for the two things that he demanded be removed from this excellent defense authorization bill. He said, we are not going to defend the American homeland from any nuclear, biological, or chemical missile attack. If it comes from a rogue nation like Iran, where 8 days ago today, 200 of

their congressmen, whatever they call them, in their national assembly came to their feet and chanted and screamed, “Death to America”; and every analyst will tell you that 5 years in the short term and 10 years at the maximum, they will have a nuclear weapon, as CBS and PBS in documentaries on Desert Storm reported that Iraq was within a year of nuclear weapons.

We simply must hold Mr. Clinton to account for making us take up national missile defense and for making him take out our provisions not to put U.S. troops under foreign or U.N. command.

Vote for this rule and support the authorization bill.

For immediate release, January 23, 1996.

DORNAN “RELUCTANTLY” SUPPORTS NEW DEFENSE CONFERENCE REPORT

“I am very disappointed that we have been unable to retain two very important provisions in the fiscal year 1996 Defense Authorization Conference Report due to objections from the Clinton administration. Provisions dealing with U.N. foreign command of U.S. troops and deploying a national ballistic missile defense have been removed from the new conference report despite the clearly demonstrated importance of these provisions. If it were not for the other important provisions of the report, specifically financial benefits for soldiers deploying to Bosnia, I would not hesitate voting against this new bill. However, unlike the President, I am unwilling to put politics ahead of the welfare of our troops and their families and will support this conference report when it comes to the House floor for a vote,” commented Congressman Robert K. Dornan (R-Garden Grove), Chairman of the House National Security Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

Dornan, one of the original authors of the U.N./foreign command provision after introducing H.R. 3334 in response to the loss of 19 U.S. soldiers in Somalia in 1993, still believes that there is great danger of another command disaster under this administration. “We must preserve an American chain of command and chain of responsibility for American troops and their families. If we never act on this issue, we may again face another Mogadishu in Bosnia, Haiti, or elsewhere.”

Dornan was also very disappointed at the lack of a clear commitment to deploying multiple missile defense sites by 2003 to protect the continental United States from attack by ballistic missiles. “Fortunately, despite lack of language, we still did increase funding for vital missile defense programs such as Navy upper tier which will provide our forward deployed forces and allies a near term/low cost defense against attack. Without this funding, debate over deployment dates and the ABM Treaty might become meaningless.”

“These changes represent the wide gap between this administration and the American public on national security issues. I sincerely hope the American people remember these critical differences on November 5th 1996!”

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

□ 1315

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, in this body not a day goes by that we do not deify the military. Yet in this bill is a provision that would leave a woman

stranded, while serving her country, without medical care, if the medical care she happens to need is a legal abortion. A compromise had been reached whereby she would have to pay 100 percent of the cost. Instead, in this bill, she would be left alone to go off base, perhaps in a foreign country and not speaking the language, to find that medical care.

It is always wrong, Mr. Speaker, and it is always against the American tradition, to interfere with a fundamental right to privacy. It is particularly wrong to toss a member of the military to the winds in need of medical care, particularly when she may be in a foreign country.

This is a fundamental right; it is not going to be withdrawn. So the strategy to humiliate people and make it difficult for them to be able to exercise the right is the prevailing strategy of this session.

The exercise of this right is understandably painful to many who oppose the right. It is painful to me to see someone exercise their first amendment free speech rights when they are speaking words that I find painful. But in this country, we do not try to extinguish constitutional rights by making them difficult or impossible to exercise. We particularly must not operate that way when dealing with women who serve their country in the U.S. military.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, may I respond respectfully to my friend, the prior speaker.

As the author of the amendment cutting off abortions in military hospitals, an offer to pay for part of it does not take care of all of the hospital costs and all of the attendant costs to someone using a facility to stop human life.

I would just like to make part of the debate the following statement: Not a single doctor, female or male, or nurse in the U.S. military wrote to me not to cut this off. Quite to the contrary, all of the doctors in Europe, every one of them and every anesthesiologist and all of the doctors in the Pacific, said: Chairman DORNAN, cut off this killing. We do not want to do it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on National Security who has worked hard all year on this bill, today is a very difficult day for me. It is with great sadness that I rise with great concern for this rule and this conference report.

The conference report we will vote on today is very similar to the one vetoed by President Clinton in late December

with some notable exceptions. Several controversial sections have been removed. Although I disagree, I might have supported this report without the missile defense language and funding for the President's peacekeeping misadventures, and we might have argued those another day.

However, the conference agreed to drop a section of the bill that restricted the President's ability to place American troops under U.N. command. How ironic that today we will vote on this bill when just this morning a military court in Germany court-martialed Army Specialist Michael New, an American hero who refused to wear a uniform that signified allegiance to a foreign government, and dishonorably discharged him. Had this section been included in last year's bill, Michael New would be a decorated soldier today who would be proudly serving his country.

We have overwhelmingly voted this in the past. I hope this rule is defeated and we have a bill that America can be proud of and we can vote for.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the revised conference report on the Department of Defense Authorization Act. While I preferred the conference report that a majority of Members supported last month, I support adoption of this measure and urge the President to sign it into law.

This legislation deserves our strong endorsement. The bill before us will result in substantial Federal acquisition reform, which will eliminate paperwork and procedural hurdles and will save the Defense Department and taxpayer's billions of dollars. The bill also authorizes a full pay raise for active duty military personnel and provides equity in cost of living payments for our military retirees.

Chairman SPENCE and the leadership of the National Security Committee have also addressed shortfalls in military construction and basic equipment such as trucks, jeeps and ammunition. We also provide additional F-15 and F-16 fighters, which will meet a critical Air Force need. In addition, the production base for the B-2 Stealth Bomber is maintained, which will enable additional aircraft to be manufactured and will allow older bombers, which are prohibitively expensive to operate and support, to be retired.

This is sound legislation and I ask for a "yes" vote on the rule and the conference report.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise with some reservation to support this bill, reservations which have been adequately expressed by previous speakers.

Mr. Speaker, it shouldn't have had to come to this. We shouldn't have to be revisiting the same issue over and over again. And yet, here we are 6 weeks after spending United States troops to Bosnia voting again on whether we should properly support American service men and women—men and women who are repeatedly sent to the far corners of the world to settle other people's conflicts.

In my home district, I have the honor of representing the fine men and women who serve at Fort Dix and McGuire Air Force Base and Lakehurst Naval War Center. In the tradition of those who served before them, these dedicated individuals responded within hours to the President's decision to deploy troops to Bosnia. Guard and Reserve soldiers were readied at Fort Dix; supplies were flown out of and through McGuire; air crews were sent to Europe and the Balkans to ensure our forces were well equipped and supported. While many of these service members have personal misgivings about the mission, they put aside those doubts, saluted smartly, and got on with the business at hand.

With little or no notice, these men and women left their homes and families to an extremely uncertain situation. They mobilized just as Christmas celebrations were beginning, leaving behind sons and daughters, spouses, and mothers and fathers to carry on as best they could. These men and women deserve our support. They deserve the full pay raise which we promised; they deserve the increase in the basic allowance benefit; and they deserve the COLA equity fix contained in this bill. Let's do the right thing.

Let's pass the rule and pass this Defense authorization bill. We are duty-bound to do no less.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very good bill, especially as my colleagues had mentioned for the Reserve components. I ask my colleagues, do they know that one-third of the military forces that we have today are in the National Guard and Reserve? Do they know how much money we get out of this bill today? We only get 10 percent of it. So it is a good buy for the taxpayers.

However, under this legislation we were able to add \$770 million for new equipment for all of the Reserves and give them better equipment to operate with. The technicians for the Guard

and Reserves were raised by 1,250 people. These are the ones that run our armories and our reserve centers.

We have a number of National Guardsmen and Reservists that are flying on these great airplanes into Bosnia, and, if they do not get an extension of 44 days, they cannot get paid. Under this bill, we have given them an extension of 44 days that they will get their pay for doing this special flying. There is a youth challenge program that is extended for 18 months, a wonderful program.

The National Guard can still do community service if it is tied to training. There was talk about not letting the National Guard use the equipment in the different States. It would be a terrible mistake. Under this bill, the National Guard can help out the community.

Instead of cutting each fighter squadron to 12 in the Air National Guard and Reserve, the bill provides for 15 aircraft in each squadron. The bill includes a program that I was proud to sponsor. It is a buy-down of interest rates for service personnel at military bases where there is a shortage of houses. This is the way it works. It would cover personnel with the rank of E-4 and above, and buy-downs their mortgage interest rate, 3 percent in the first year, 2 percent in the second year, and 1 percent for the third year of the loan. This would help the enlisted person get them housing where it is not available on the base.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, there are also kickers for the educational benefits for Reservists, just like the active forces get for special MO's. This can be implemented by the Secretary of Defense. This is a good bill and I certainly support it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY], a distinguished and very effective new member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and of the DOD authorization conference report. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for this rule and especially thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for his diligent work on trying to get this bill to the floor and get this bill into law. It has a lot of important provisions and, I think, not the least of which is the 2.4-percent pay raise for our military and the COLA equity for our military retirees.

However, as has already been addressed this morning and this afternoon, one important provision is missing, which is the provision which prohibits placement of the U.S. forces under U.N. operational and tactical control.

Many in this body, including myself, strongly oppose any time our Armed Forces are being asked to be put under U.N. command or control. The President of the United States is the Com-

mander in Chief, and I think it is wrong for him to cede his authority, his constitutional authority to the United Nations. Apparently the President does not feel this way, and he has insisted that this provision prohibiting our troops coming under control of the United Nations, he has insisted that it be taken out. I nevertheless support this rule and this bill, and I, with some reservations, urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my great disappointment that the conferees have chosen to retain the section of the bill which would require the discharge of military personnel who test positive for HIV. This provision was cited by the President in his veto message as blatantly discriminatory, exalting ideology over common sense. The Department of Defense itself has consistently opposed this provision. It is unnecessary, unjust, and unwise, and I deeply regret that the conferees have chosen to retain it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my disappointment and dismay that the conferees have chosen to retain section 567 of this bill, which would require the discharge or retirement of military personnel who test positive for HIV.

As the President acknowledged in his message vetoing the first conference report, this is a blatantly discriminatory measure which exalts ideology over common sense. It is justified by neither the need to ensure military readiness nor any other legitimate legislative concern.

The Department of Defense has consistently opposed this provision on a number of grounds. First, the number of servicemembers who test positive for HIV is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the active force and does not pose a significant problem for our military.

Second, these servicemembers are experienced, highly trained, and physically fit, and it will not enhance readiness to deprive the Armed Forces of their services.

And third, if and when their medical conditions render them unable to carry out their duties, current law already requires that these servicemembers be separated or retired. Moreover, current law gives the Secretary of Defense full authority to discharge even asymptomatic individuals should he determine that their retention would adversely affect the military mission.

The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that this measure is not about military readiness. Had it been so, it would not have singled out service members with one particular medical condition, but would have mandated the discharge of all who are non-worldwide assignable due to a medical condition, whether they suffer from asthma, diabetes, cancer, or heart disease. That would have been no less gratuitous, but it would at least have had the virtue of consistency.

Why, then, are only servicemembers with HIV to be discharged? The answer is inescapable: The proponents of this measure believe

that people living with HIV/AIDS do not deserve the same consideration and compassion afforded those with other medical conditions.

Nor is it too far fetched to suggest that, for some, this provision is really a proxy by which they hope to bring about the discharge of HIV-positive servicemembers who happen to be gay. The shifting demographics of this disease make it less and less likely that they will actually achieve this result, but there are undoubtedly some gay servicemembers who will be discharged under this provision who up to now have managed to weather the unending waves of persecution to which they have been subjected.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I object to what is perhaps the most mean-spirited aspect of this provision: It not only deprives these men and women of their careers, but by requiring their discharge rather than providing for their medical retirement, it denies them continued medical care at Department of Defense facilities. The bill allows these servicemembers all of 30 days of transitional care before consigning them to Veterans' Administration facilities—most of which are ill-equipped to serve their needs. What is more, those who are enrolled in military medical research would no longer be eligible to participate as volunteers.

This is an unconscionable way to treat people who have honorably served their country. It also places in jeopardy one of the most important clinical vaccine programs in the world. Given the human and strategic significance of the advancing pandemic, this is unforgivably shortsighted.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this provision is unnecessary, unwise, and unjust. I urge the House to reject the conference report.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to be in the position that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is in. This is a really tough situation for him, and I am really delighted with the work that he has done on this bill to finally at least get a conference report that will have the authorization in place. I am going to vote for it. But I have to say that it is with some great reluctance, particularly with respect to the ABM section of the bill.

Let me read first of all what the President said in his message. This is his veto message:

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, which would require a multiple-site architecture that cannot be accommodated within the terms of the existing ABM Treaty.

Well, let us just think about how intelligent our intelligence community is with respect to their speculation about this foreseeable or nonforeseeable, as they say, threat to the United States, and I will make it as current as this morning.

Dateline, January 23, Beijing, China, New York Times, says that preparations for a missile attack on Taiwan by

China and the target selection to carry it out have been completed and await a final decision by the Politburo in Beijing. A senior Chinese official is quoted as asserting, "China could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan."

Obviously a veiled threat against the United States, a veiled threat of a missile attack against Los Angeles, the idea being that we would not defend our ally in Taiwan against a missile attack, because we would be afraid that China would launch a missile attack against Los Angeles or New York or Cleveland, or Washington, DC.

□ 1330

Mr. President, the whole idea is that we have got to get rid of the ABM Treaty. Mr. President, we have to wake up in this country. There is a real threat. It is a genuine threat, and the first thing or the first order of business, the first responsibility of any moral government, is to protect its citizens. That means beginning with the repeal of the ABM Treaty.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and passage of the DOD authorization bill. I would like to commend especially the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman SPENCE, and the gentleman from California, ranking member DELLUMS, for their hard work on this very important piece of legislation.

While the authorization process has dragged on far longer than expected, I certainly applaud their commitment to its completion and the resolution of some very many contentious issues surrounding the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to congratulate the parties involved for bringing to closure the issue of equity in the COLA for military retirees and civil service retirees, and especially also for bringing a full pay raise for our men and women in uniform. As many Members fully understand, Guam is the home to very many people in uniform, but perhaps not equally understood is that very many of our own people are in the service.

I also want to draw attention to some concerns I have. I have serious concerns about the reductions in the environmental cleanup funding included in this legislation. But I am pleased with the compromise reached on funding of technical assistance for restoration advisory boards at military bases. RAB's are critical to building strong relations between the military and local communities. The small amount of technical assistance that RAB's receive enables them to acquire reliable and independent information that maintains this strong relation.

I especially want to point out, and appreciate the attention of the chairman and ranking member, a particular issue of concern to Guam. At a time when Guam is suffering from the largest BRAC reductions and closures of any American community, the commitment to assist in this process is important.

For the first time, Guam is included as a U.S. area for the repair of vessels. It may sound incredible, but Guam up to this time had to compete with foreign SRF's for the repair of U.S. vessels in voyage repairs.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman and ranking member for their work on this legislation, and I urge passage of the rule and ultimately the legislation.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a wise leader on the Committee on National Security and my good friend.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the consideration of the authorization conference report and ask for support for the bill. I would like to address my comments, in closing, to the issue of missile defense and what we did as authorizers on the conference committee to bring forth a bill that this administration would hopefully sign into law, in spite of the objections they raised earlier this year and last year in terms of the missile defense provisions.

Some would say that perhaps we negotiated too far and that in fact we no longer have as a priority the issue of national missile defense. I am here to say, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. This is not the end of the fight, this is the beginning of what promises to be a war in this country, in this session of the Congress, on the fate of the future of protecting the people of America from missile proliferation and the threat of a rogue attack.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the administration say they tried in good faith to negotiate with us. Mr. Speaker, I say, hogwash, disingenuous, totally misleading and totally self-serving. I was in those negotiations, Mr. Speaker, with three other Members of the Congress. In fact, no other House Members were present. It was Senator NUNN, it was Senator THURMOND, and it was Senator LOTT. We invited the administration over in the form of Bob Bell, and we in good faith addressed the 12 specific issues that he raised.

But, Mr. Speaker, it was like negotiating with a bowl of jelly, because in the end the administration had no intent on coming to grips with this issue of whether or not to protect America from the threat of a rogue attack. We in good faith in fact compromised in each of the 12 areas. We made a good faith effort to change language to give the administration the changes they

asked for. But, Mr. Speaker, in the end the President did not want a bill and would not agree to the bill because we finally held his feet to the fire and said we want to deploy a system by a date certain. Where was this date certain picked from? It was picked from the recommendations of the President's own administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of rhetoric during the debate on the floor. We heard this was going to violate the ABM Treaty. Guess what, Mr. Speaker? A week ago Monday, the administration's point person on missile defense said that we can protect the entire 50 States from a single site by either using the Air Force or the Army program, which would in no way violate the ABM Treaty. All of a sudden the administration has no more argument that our efforts would have in fact violated ABM, because in fact the administration's own point person said that is not the case. Then the administration shifted gears and said it might jeopardize START II.

Mr. Speaker, I just spent 7 days in Russia where I met with the leaders of the Yeltsin administration on proliferation and on arms control issues. They were not pressing me on the issue of an allowable program under the ABM treaty. They are pressing me on expansion of NATO.

Why has this President not chosen to speak to the issue of Russia's concern with expanding NATO? If they want to know the real cutting edge issue that will cause START II to be delayed in Russia, it is not what we want to do, it is the administration's rhetoric about NATO and what it wants to do. We did not hear that in the debate on the House floor.

Then we heard, Mr. Speaker, the administration finally resort to a last ditch argument, because they could not make the argument on the ABM Treaty alone, because this bill originally did not attack the ABM Treaty. It did it in compliance with the treaty, even though many of us feel the treaty has outlived its usefulness and ultimately has to be changed. They then said there is no threat.

Get this, Mr. Speaker: The administration comes out with the most politically biased intelligence brief I have ever seen in my 10 years here, gives Senator LEVIN a political letter from the Deputy Director of the CIA for use in debate on the Senate floor, saying there will be no threat in 15 years, even though we requested this information for months. Two weeks later we are able to get advanced telemetry equipment the Russians are sending to Iraq to be used for a long range ICBM. The treat is there, it is real, and the battle for a national missile defense system is just beginning.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to state, so my colleagues will understand very clearly, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] made the point, that this President does not want to defend the United States against incoming ballistic missiles. That was his major objection to this bill, along with the idea that he also wants to have the right to delegate to foreign commanders the command of U.S. troops.

We are now going to enter a period in which it is important for Members of this House who feel that defense is important to enter a full-court press this year to develop defenses against incoming ballistic missiles, both for the people of the United States and for our troops in theater. We are going to do this.

The President has given up his most solemn responsibility, and that is to defend the people of the United States of America, and he is denied that responsibility in this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this rule and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would urge the adoption of this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 340, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of January 22, 1996, at H351.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of H.R. 1530 over the Christmas holiday was unfortunate and unjustified. As I stated several weeks ago when the House attempted to override the veto, if it has achieved nothing else, the President's veto has helped to further highlight the stark differences between the Congress and the President on critical issues of national security.

There were two primary issues on which the original bill was vetoed. First, was the provision in the original bill that called for the deployment of a national missile defense system—that is, a defense of the American people—by early next century. And second, was the provision 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.

Expressing what I know to be the sentiment of many of my colleagues, these are issues of basic, fundamental principle. Accordingly, a majority of the conferees believed that no deal with President Clinton on these issues in this bill was far preferable to a bad deal.

Therefore, the conferees removed the national missile defense and U.N. command and control language that the President objected to so strongly rather than weaken the provisions. Nobody should think, however, that this is the last that either this Congress or this President has seen of these issues.

On both issues, however, the conference report still retains: Full funding for ballistic missile defense programs, including an increase of \$450 million over the President's request for national missile defense programs; strong direction on critically important theater missile defense programs; and a provision of permanent law prohibiting the Department of Defense from paying the U.S. share of the costs of U.N. peacekeeping operations.

This conference report remains critically important for the numerous pay, allowances, benefits and reforms that it contains. This is why so much effort has been expended in such a short period of time to turn this conference report around. I support this conference report which, through two conferences now, has remained true to the four basic defense priorities this House established and articulated beginning early last year: improving military quality of life; sustaining core military readiness; reinvigorating lagging modernization programs; and beginning the long overdue process of Pentagon reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the troops and their families with a "yes" vote on the conference report. It is time to put our money where our mouths are.

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] for the purposes of conducting a colloquy.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. Could the chairman please describe the outcome reached by the conferees on S. 1124 with regards to the B-2 bomber program?

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman would yield, the conference outcome on the B-2 was identical to the outcome on

H.R. 1530 which the President vetoed. It successfully establishes the conditions necessary to permit the production of additional B-2 bombers beyond the currently authorized 20 aircraft.

There is a key issue, however, that requires clarification for the legislative record. First, as both the bill and report language clearly indicate, the fence on the obligation of B-2 funds until March 31, 1996, applies only to the \$493 million in additional fiscal year 1996 procurement funds. In no way does this fence impact obligation of prior year B-2 funding.

Therefore, the balance of the \$125 million authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1995 to sustain the B-2 industrial base is available immediately for such purposes. The use of the phrase "merge with the \$493 million" in no way captures any prior year funding and refers only to the use of those funds for the same purpose as the \$493 million.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the chairman. Is it therefore the chairman's perspective that the purpose for which the additional \$493 million is being authorized is the facilitation and acquisition of long-lead items necessary to procure additional B-2 aircraft if such a decision is made in the future?

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman would yield. Consistent with the purposes specified in House Report 104-131 and House Report 104-208, the increased authorization of \$493 million for the program is for the purpose of reestablishing critical elements of the B-2 production line and procuring long-lead items consistent with the acquisition of additional B-2 aircraft.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the Chairman for his clarification.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of the committee, in bringing to the floor the conference report on Senate bill S. 1124, the Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1996.

As Members know, and as the gentleman has already indicated, this is the second conference report that has been brought to the floor on fiscal year 1996. I am pleased that after the President's veto and the Congress' sustaining of that veto of the first conference report, that the conferees agreed to drop many of the provisions that the President and many of us in this Chamber found objectionable.

With respect to the National Missile Defense program, and what this gentleman perceives to be a tax on the ABM Treaty, I am pleased that the concerted attack on the important antiballistic missile treaty was finally removed from the report. The revised star wars concept that the conferees eliminated from the bill would have been a return, in this gentleman's humble opinion, to a program, Mr. Speaker, in search of a threat.



The intelligence community has reiterated on numerous occasions its assessment that there is no threat to justify the rapid deployment of a missile defense system at this time, one that is at this point unnecessary and extraordinarily expensive. This is particularly important in view of the fact that such a plan has, indeed, the potential for the abrogation of the ABM Treaty.

With respect to command and control, the conferees also dropped the provision that would have restricted the President in his role as Commander in Chief. With respect to contingency operations, the conferees also dropped the provision that required the President to fund contingency operations in a specific way.

Fourth, with respect to the pay raise, I am pleased that the provision to provide the full 2.4-percent pay increase to our troops was included in this report. But I continue to believe, Mr. Speaker, and would reiterate at this time, that it should not have been held hostage to such a controversial bill in the first place.

While this bill represents an improvement over the original bill, it still commits the Nation to a national security posture and spending plan that is misguided at best.

Some of the provisions of this conference report continue to concern me, and my concerns are as follows: One, the HIV provision which states that anyone testing positive for HIV must be discharged, regardless of circumstance. This has enormous implications, Mr. Speaker; not only enormous implications for people inside the military. I would believe that one day we will be back here revisiting this provision, because it would just wreak havoc on a number of people in the military who have tested positive.

But above and beyond those concerns that are specific and exclusive to the U.S. military, at a time when AIDS is an incredible disease in this country, we should not be sending the message from the Federal Government that citizens should not be tested. The one way, Mr. Speaker, that we gain knowledge about this incredible disease that is killing and destroying human beings in America, try to understand it, to gain some control, is by testing.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government sends the message that to be tested is to be harmed, that, in this gentleman's opinion, is a foreboding, incredible statement that this Nation should not be sending, because the potential for your children, Mr. Speaker, our children, and our children's children are at stake.

We need to be about understanding, learning, treating, and controlling this disease. To communicate that message is awesome, in this gentleman's opinion.

Second, provisions restricting open communication in awarding shipbuilding contracts. Think about that, Mr. Speaker. At a time when we are considering billions of dollars, provisions are

included in this bill that would retard competition. Is that good government?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we would be back in these Chambers one day, Mr. Speaker, and we would rue the day that there are provisions in this bill that would retard competition for the use of Federal dollars.

Third, almost \$500 million is included for B-2 bombers that is not required by the administration. If my colleagues heard the colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], the essence of that colloquy was that this \$493 million is designed for the purpose of purchasing long-lead items that ultimately result in the purchase of additional B-2's.

I would submit in these Chambers, Mr. Speaker, that this is a weapons system we do not need, a weapons system we cannot afford, and finally, a weapons system for which there are alternatives.

Fourth, it resurrects, Mr. Speaker, the antisatellite program. What can be more bizarre than \$30 million to resurrect the antisatellite program potentially placing us in a position of further militarizing space, with the potential of all of the destabilization that goes with gaining the capacity to destroy satellites, the eyes and ears of nations in moments of controversy and difficulty?

Next, it constrains in certain ways the cooperative threat reduction program euphemistically, referred to as the Nunn-Lugar program.

Next, it reduces funding for environmental cleanup programs at a time when we are closing military installations all over the Nation and people in local communities wanting to convert those lands to higher and better use in their community, when we ought to be cleaning them up as rapidly and as expeditiously as we can. In this bill we find where the Department of Defense, in the conduct of its activities, has polluted many of these facilities, we ought to be about trying to do that as rapidly as possible, and we retard it by reducing the funds in this program.

We terminate the technology investment program. What we do in this bill is simply fund those programs that are in the pipeline. We then end it at a time when, in the context of a post-cold-war world, we ought to be answering the question: How do we convert from a heavy reliance on military purchases and militarism, and converting ourselves to an economy rooted in the principles of peace and the reality of a post-cold-war world?

This bill, also, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], my distinguished colleague, in the context of her discussion on the floor regarding the rule pointed out that this bill retains a provision that would eliminate the right of women, with certain exceptions, in the military to receive—at their own expense—abortion services at military facilities overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I would add parenthetically that this provision was incorporated in this significant piece of legislation without one single hearing. The same can be said with respect to my comments regarding HIV.

Finally, this bill still adds \$7 billion, not million, \$7 billion over and above the President's request for the authorization for the Department of Defense in the context of a post-cold-war world and during a period of time when we even shut this Government down around the issue of balanced budgets.

Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate one more time that we spend virtually as much as all of the other nations combined in our military budget. And when we add the U.S. military expenditures with the expenditures of its allies, it constitutes slightly in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget. Which means that if everyone else in the world is perceived as an enemy, which is bizarre, extreme, and absurd, but let us for the moment for the sake of discussion in this moment assume that that is real, we still, along with our friends, are outspending the rest of the world 4 to 1.

In this bill, when we talk about balancing the budget and cutting health care and cutting education, and other programs, \$7 billion, \$7 billion to buy this weapons system and that weapons system and the other weapons system because we need it? Because there is someone out there poised to attack the United States? Because there still is a Soviet Union? Because there is still some extreme enemy out there? No, because it helps someone's economy. Because at the end of the day, this is about jobs in the local community.

My response is I understand work. I understand jobs. I understand the need for people to have work that is dignified, that allows them to take care of themselves, their family, and their loved ones, to feed their people, to clothe their people, to house them, to educate them.

But is the way to create jobs to use the military budget to purchase expensive and unnecessary and potentially dangerous weapons systems to produce jobs? No, it is about facing the reality of a peacetime economy, of a post-cold-war world, developing an approach to the American economy that addresses those realities where we stimulate the economy to expand its employment, to move toward full employment, not by building B-2's and building ships we do not need and building rockets we do not need and building all those expensive and unnecessary weapons systems. Every study that I have seen shows that that is an awesome cost to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we need jobs. On that point I am totally sympathetic. Where I am not sympathetic is that we should use the military budget as a jobs bill. The military budget should address our national security needs.

□ 1400

So in conclusion, several points have been addressed in this bill that the President saw as important issues dealing with the veto. They have been dropped. The pay raise has been included. But there are still a number of issues out there that would allow Members to continue to rise in opposition to this report. And though we have now come back with a bill that is better than the one the President vetoed, it is still a bill that this gentleman cannot support.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of our 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. Mr. Speaker, briefly I would ask our colleagues on the other side that perhaps they should start the conversation of increased spending with the man in the White House. We talked about the \$7 billion item. It was President Clinton who signed the appropriation bill, which my understanding is, it contains \$7 billion more.

To my amazement, in California, President Clinton gave a speech where he talked about seeing the need for more B-2's. This is President Clinton, the champion of cutting defense. I can guarantee Members he will be at every shipyard where there are funded programs for new ships being constructed this year. Unfortunately, we have a disingenuous White House.

Let me talk about missile defense for a moment, because what we have heard has been nothing but rhetoric and hogwash. Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that General O'Neill did not confirm my statement on the floor until a week after we voted on the defense bill. When my colleagues on the left said we could not build a low-cost missile defense system from a single site without violating the ABM, General O'Neill says on the record we can. The Air Force can do it for about \$2.5 billion over 4 years. The Army can do it for \$5 billion over 4 years, and both of them can do it in compliance with the ABM treaty. This is all in the public record, I might add.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we heard our colleagues talk about no threat. I was in Russia last week. I want to tell Members, when I was at the Kremlin meeting with Yeltsin's advisors on proliferation, I asked them a simple question, Can you explain to me how the advanced telemetry equipment for a long-range ICBM was obtained going from Russia to Iraq?

Do my colleagues know what they said? We know nothing of this incident. Mr. Speaker, we have the devices in our hands with the Russian markings on them. Do Members know why the administration does not want to

confront this issue? Because it is a direct violation of the MTCR. This administration would rather bury its head in the sand than to face the Russians on a direct violation of the missile technology control regime. This administration has sanitized intelligence more than any other administration in the history of this country.

The most outrageous thing about what this President is doing is undermining the ability of this country to protect our people. That is outrageous.

When I asked Ambassador Pickering for an answer, he said, We did not ask the question yet. That is outrageous, and we will get to the bottom of that story in the appropriate hearing scenarios.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in favor of sustaining the President's veto of this bill, I said that 1 week of earnest negotiation could produce an acceptable bill. I want to give credit to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They were flexible on the three issues most opposed by the administration. We now have a bill I think which on balance is worthy of support. I congratulate my friend and my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], for navigating this difficult bill through a difficult conference.

I am happy with the pay raise, with the increased housing allowances. I think all Members of this House should be, and I am hopeful that these payments will not be any longer delayed. I am pleased, too, to see that there are provisions here that will ensure that there is a timely COLA for military retirees. They earned it; they are entitled to it. So I will vote for this conference report and I will encourage my colleagues to do the same.

But I do have concerns that I want to express. I am concerned that this bill is not the long-term blueprint for the defense budget which we need. I want to sound a friendly caveat to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. If we do not discipline the add-ons in the next defense bill more diligently, we have a train wreck coming just down the track.

This bill makes costly commitments like more B-2's, and I voted for the money, but it makes costly commitments like that without tackling any of the tradeoffs necessary to carry those commitments through in the years ahead.

This bill starts up an antisatellite weapon, expensive, a space-based laser, expensive, dubious technology, four prototype submarines, without resolving just where all this money is going to be found to carry these programs to fruition.

This bill speeds up existing programs like the Navy's Upper Tier, the Navy's

Lower Tier theater missile defense systems, the Army's Comanche helicopter, the Air Force space and missile tracking system, so-called Brilliant Eyes. It is doubtful we can maintain the speed in the years ahead.

Unlike the appropriation bill, this bill mandates milestones, program milestones, dates when things have to be done, deadlines for a host of different programs. This is congressional micromanagement. It is a practice that is often questioned, often decried by those very Members who are practicing it here right in this very bill.

I, Mr. Speaker, see no way to sustain funding for all these initiatives in the outyears. Between now and the year 2002, it is true that the Republican budget for national security will add some additional money over and above the Clinton defense budget, but it is only \$18.4 billion plus 1 percent of the total amount to be spent on national security in the next 7 years. If we follow through with all the systems that this bill either starts up or spends up, we will need a lot more money than \$18.4 billion.

If we do not come up with that additional money, we will have to slow down or stop in future years that which we are starting up or speeding up this year. That is not an efficient way to spend the scarce dollars that we have for national defense.

It is also not good precedent to authorize \$821 million for national missile defense with nary a word about how Congress wants this program structured and how this money should be spent.

I know that striking all the national missile defense language was the best we could do, if we wanted an authorization bill, and I hope this year when we do the bill we can settle on common ground and not repeat this precedent of authorizing \$821 million without any direct examination or guidance.

I know that those who wanted the national missile defense provisions, the language in this bill, think that the ABM Treaty is outdated and a barrier to ballistic missile defense development. They have got a point. The ABM Treaty is 23-years old, but the ABM Treaty does not bar any particular development that we will do this year or in the immediate future. And if we imply, even imply in an act of Congress that we would possibly violate or even want to abrogate or renegotiate the ABM Treaty, then we may put ratification of START II by the Russia Duma in even greater risk that it faces now. START II will reduce Russia's nuclear arsenal by some 5,000 warheads. The missiles that carry these will be dismantled. The silos will be filled with concrete. The warheads will be stored in a facility built according to U.S. specifications in Tomsk, Siberia. And as to these 5,000 warheads, if this comes to pass START II will give us 100 percent defense effectiveness.

So for the sake of ballistic missile defense, we should concentrate now on

ratification of START II and later, when it is necessary and the time is propitious, then we can concentrate on amendments to the ABM Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, every year since 1959, we have had an authorization bill. A lot of Members do not understand that we really did not have an authorization process prior to that date, and it has built up since then. It is more necessary than ever, now that we are in a period of changing national defense years. This is an important bill. We should not break precedent and fail to pass it this year.

Since we settled the three most contentious issues, the pay raise for the troops is here, the increase in the housing allowance, all rides on this bill, I will vote for it and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge Members to vote "yes" on S. 1124, the revised fiscal year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act, and point out that this is just another example of how Members on our side have reached out and tried to cooperate with this administration.

The White House and a minority of Members in the House and Senate have objected to the original conference bill because for the first time Republicans committed this country to the actual deployment of effective missile defense systems. I have to say that an article from the New York Times today, page A3, which has been referred to earlier, discusses a veiled threat from China to bomb Los Angeles by way of missiles. I am absolutely shocked that the administration and certain Members in this House and the other body would try, would actually leave this country defenseless against such a threat to the continental United States.

I want to put the administration on notice that these concessions on missile defense policy are only temporary, and they are made because we do need this entire bill. Important provisions in it like the 2.4-percent military pay raise; the 5.2-percent increase for housing allowances for our military families; the military retiree COLA fix; increases for family housing construction so that one-fourth of all barracks do not remain substandard; increases in modernization to stop the 71-percent decline in procurement since 1985; and various Pentagon reforms.

This is a good bill. It was a good bill in its entirety, and it is a good bill today. But it is missing this vital ingredient, to protect the men, women and children of America from the potential devastation of an incoming missile. That to me is mindboggling, that we would just abdicate our respon-

sibility to defend against such a threat is wholly mindless.

I would like to make some additional points. While the President talks about the serious threat posed by nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons proliferation, it is clear to me he is not serious about doing anything to combat these threats.

The President's blind devotion to the ABM Treaty is leaving our Nation increasingly vulnerable. His lip service to ballistic missile defense is just that, a placebo that places our Nation at serious risk.

Although the conferees have dropped ballistic missile defense language from this conference agreement—but it is not because of agreement with the President. It was done because we cannot condone the administration's efforts to water down our ballistic missile defense program. We will not be party to this irresponsible act.

Instead, this year the Congress will initiate its own "spring offensive." The Congress will make certain that ballistic missile defense is one of our Nation's top priorities. Despite the obstruction of the President today, the Congress will pursue a vigorous ballistic missile agenda this year. Chairman SPENCE and the National Security Committee intend to hold extensive hearings on this critical issue to thoroughly review the nature of this threat, and determine the programmatic options available to defeat this threat. I am confident that the Defense subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee will also do its part in this critical review.

Let me repeat—we will not be party to the President's total unwillingness to respond to this growing threat.

I strongly believe it is now incumbent upon the Congress to fashion its own ballistic missile defense program and policy. At the same time, the Congress must also begin devising a responsible strategy for withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. This treaty's time has come and passed. Overtaken by technological progress, this treaty now represents the ultimate placebo. If America is to defend itself in the future, ballistic missile defense must be our highest priority. We cannot continue to adhere to an antiquated arms control treaty which directly negates the ability of the United States to protect itself from ballistic missile attack. This would be a mistake of tragic proportions—a mistake which will directly affect the security of our children and grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, this issue will be revisited. We will not go away. I urge the passage and adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I included for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1996]  
AS CHINA THREATENS TAIWAN, IT MAKES SURE  
U.S. LISTENS

(By Patrick E. Tyler)

BEIJING, Jan. 23—The Chinese leadership has sent unusually explicit warnings to the Clinton Administration that China has com-

pleted plans for a limited attack on Taiwan that could be mounted in the weeks after Taiwan's President, Lee Tenghui, wins the first democratic balloting for the presidency in March.

The purpose of this saber-rattling is apparently to prod the United States to rein in Taiwan and President Lee, whose push for greater international recognition for the island of 21 million people, has been condemned here as a drive for independence.

While no one familiar with the threats thinks China is on the verge of risking a catastrophic war against Taiwan, some China experts fear that the Taiwan issue has become such a test of national pride for Chinese leaders that the danger of war should be taken seriously.

A senior American official said the Administration has "no independent confirmation or even credible evidence" that the Chinese are contemplating an attack, and spoke almost dismissively of the prospect.

"They can fire missiles, but Taiwan has some teeth of its own," the official said. "And does China want to risk that and the international effects?"

The most pointed of the Chinese warnings was conveyed recently through a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Chas. W. Freeman Jr., who traveled to China this winter for discussions with senior Chinese officials. On Jan. 4, after returning to Washington, Mr. Freeman informed President Clinton's national security adviser, Anthony Lake, that the People's Liberation Army had prepared plans for a missile attack against Taiwan consisting of one conventional missile strike a day for 30 days.

The warning followed similar statements relayed to Administration officials by John W. Lewis, a Stanford University political scientist who meets frequently with senior Chinese military figures here.

These warnings do not mean that an attack on Taiwan is certain or imminent. Instead, a number of China specialists say that China, through "credible preparations" for an attack, hopes to intimidate the Taiwanese and to influence American policy toward Taiwan. The goal, these experts say, is to force Taiwan to abandon the campaign initiated by President Lee, including his effort to have Taiwan seated at the United Nations, and to end high-profile visits by President Lee to the United States and to other countries.

If the threats fail to rein in Mr. Lee, however, a number of experts now express the view that China could resort to force, despite the enormous consequences for its economy and for political stability in Asia.

Since last summer, when the White House allowed Mr. Lee to visit the United States, the Chinese leadership has escalated its attacks on the Taiwan leader, accusing him of seeking to "split the motherland" and undermine the "one China" policy that had been the bedrock of relations between Beijing and its estranged province since 1949.

A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, asked to comment on reports that the Chinese military has prepared plans for military action against Taiwan, said he was awaiting a response from his superiors. Last month, a senior ministry official said privately that China's obvious preparations for military action have been intended to head off an unwanted conflict.

"We have been trying to do all we can to avoid a scenario in which we are confronted in the end with no other option but a military one," the official said. He said that if China does not succeed in changing Taiwan's course, "then I am afraid there is going to be a war."

Mr. Freeman described the most recent warning during a meeting. Mr. Lake had

called with nongovernmental China specialists.

Participants said that Mr. Freeman's presentation was arresting as he described being told by a Chinese official of the advanced state of military planning. Preparations for a missile attack on Taiwan, he said, and the target selection to carry it out, have been completed and await a final decision by the Politburo in Beijing.

One of the most dramatic moments came when Mr. Freeman quoted a Chinese official as asserting that China could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders "care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan," a statement that Mr. Freeman characterized as an indirect threat by China to use nuclear weapons against the United States.

An account of the White House meeting was provided by some of the participants. Mr. Freeman, reached by telephone, confirmed the gist of his remarks, reiterating that he believes that while "Beijing clearly prefers negotiation to combat," there is a new sense of urgency in Beijing to end Taiwan's quest for "independent international status."

Mr. Freeman said that President's Lee's behavior "in the weeks following his re-election will determine" whether Beijing's Communist Party leaders feel they must act "by direct military means" to change his behavior.

In recent months, Mr. Freeman said he has relayed a number of warnings to United States Government officials. "I have quoted senior Chinese who told me" that China "would sacrifice 'millions of men' and 'entire cities' to assure the unity of China and who opined that the United States would not make comparable sacrifices."

He also asserted that "some in Beijing may be prepared to engage in nuclear blackmail against the U.S. to insure that Americans do not obstruct" efforts by the People's Liberation Army "to defend the principles of Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan and Chinese national unity."

Some specialists at the meeting wondered if Mr. Freeman's presentation was too alarmist and suggested that parliamentary elections on Taiwan in December had resulted in losses for the ruling Nationalist Party and that President Lee appeared to be moderating his behavior to avoid a crisis.

"I am not alarmist at this point," said one specialist, who would not comment on the substance of the White House meeting, "I don't think the evidence is developing in that direction."

Other participants in the White House meeting, who said they would not violate the confidentiality pledge of the private session, separately expressed their concern that a potential military crisis is building in the Taiwan Strait.

"I think there is evidence to suggest that the Chinese are creating at least the option to apply military pressure to Taiwan if they feel that Taiwan is effectively moving out of China's orbit politically," said Kenneth Lieberthal, a China scholar at the University of Michigan and an informal adviser to the Administration.

Mr. Lieberthal, who also has traveled to China in recent months, said Beijing has re-deployed forces from other parts of the country to the coastal areas facing Taiwan and set up new command structures "for various kinds of military action against Taiwan."

"They have done all this in a fashion they know Taiwan can monitor," he said, "so as to become credible on the use of force."

"I believe there has been no decision to use military force," he continued, "and they recognize that it would be a policy failure for

them to have to resort to force; but they have set up the option, they have communicated that in the most credible fashion and, I believe, the danger is that they would exercise it in certain circumstances."

Several experts cited their concern that actions by Congress in the aftermath of President Lee's expected election could be a critical factor contributing to a military confrontation. If President Lee perceives that he has a strong base of support in the United States Congress and presses forward with his campaign to raise Taiwan's status, the risk of a military crisis is greater, they said. A chief concern that Congress would seek to invite the Taiwan leader back to the United States as a gesture of American support. A Chinese military leader warned in November that such a step could have "explosive" results.

In recent months, American statements on whether United States forces would come to the defense of Taiwan if it came under attack have been deliberately vague so as to deter Beijing through a posture of what the Pentagon calls "strategic ambiguity."

Some members of Congress assert that the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 includes an implicit pledge to defend Taiwan if attacked, but Administration officials say that, in the end, the decision would depend on the timing, pretext and nature of Chinese aggression.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I urge Members to support it as I support it strongly.

For more than a year I have been concerned that there is a mismatch between the Nation's military strategy and the level of defense resources. Last February, I testified before the House Committee on the Budget and proposed a budget with additional and necessary funding for the military. My concerns were many. I spoke of a shortfall in funding for modernization, maintenance and infrastructure, daily operations and training.

For fiscal year 1996 alone, I proposed a minimum increase of at least \$6 billion over the administration's request as a necessary requirement to sustain a quality force into the future. I am pleased that this conference report authorizes an increase of nearly \$7 billion.

However, this conference report is not perfect. But I do point out that it does have the necessary pay increase for the young men and young women in uniform, that it has the necessary housing allowance increase. Those are so terribly important for those people who wish to make a career of our military.

There are provisions I would have deleted and others I would have added. But compromise has been necessary, and the report is a step in the right direction. It authorizes an end to the freefall in defense expenditures and includes many necessary policy initiatives. Most important, the report includes a permanent endstrength floor for personnel levels in each of the respective services. This provision alone warrants support from this body. The endstrength floors are necessary to

counter and to offset low moral resulting from the strains of increased training schedules and overseas deployments.

As our Nation sends additional troops into the Balkan region, I ask my colleagues to assure the uniformed ranks of our commitment to them. If you are for a first rate naval and marine force, then you should support this report. If you are for a healthy and capable Army, then you should support this measure. If you are for a robust and well-equipped National Guard and Reserve, you should support this package. And if you are for a strong Air Force with an unmatched B-2 bomber force, then you must support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The Chair advises Members that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

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

□ 1415

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

Mr. Speaker, the fact that we were able to take this bill after it had been vetoed by the President and run it back through a limited conference and get it back on the floor and, hopefully, get it back to the President's desk for signature, is a tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE]. I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

When we put this abbreviated conference together to get the bill back through, the gentleman from California worked equally hard to see to it that we had a Defense authorization bill.

It is important that we have this bill. This bill is about \$8 billion more than the President's initial suggestion. On the other hand, the President's own vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Owens, has said that we need to spend \$20 billion more per year on procurement. In this bill we not only have the pay raise and the increased housing allowance for the troops, but we have modernization. We have increased airlift, increased sealift, more ammunition, more precision guided munitions, and such very basic things as trucks and other transportation equipment, so we are giving the troops the equipment that they need to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying we did strip out missile defense from this bill. We said in our bill that we would defend the United States against missile attack and we would have that system, that defense system, ready by the year 2003. The President

said, "I object to defending the United States of America against missile attack," and that was his primary reason for a veto.

Mr. Speaker, on this date we should launch a campaign to overturn the decision by President Clinton to leave this country defenseless against missile attack. We live in an age of missiles. It is something the President has resisted.

We are going to start the campaign as of this day and, hopefully, at the end of this year we will have a defense authorization bill that builds a defense against ballistic missiles.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me. I further thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, because the two of us have sat next to each other on this committee for almost 24 years now. I thank him for his friendship and constant leadership on this bill.

I must say, I like the gentleman from California, but I am rising to say please vote "no" on this bill.

I really do not understand this. The favorite thing I have on my schedule today says that between 10 and 4 today I can go to either room 2340 or 2117, in each room there is one copy of this conference report, where I may go read it at that point. Mr. Speaker, I do not even know what it is we are really dealing with. I do not know where this is, why we could not see it ahead of time, what is going on. I must say, this is not the process that I was proud of in this House. I am very sorry to see that happen.

Let me go to some of the very substantive issues. Let me move off this process. In this summer, this summer the Pentagon lost \$14.5 billion. It could not find it from last year. So what do we do? For the first time in my 23 years, we reward them by giving them even more money than they asked for this time. Can Members think of another agency of Government where we would do that if this summer they had not been able to account for \$14.5 billion?

So, there would be a committee saying, "I will tell you what, the President does not want more, the Joint Chiefs do not want more, but we are going to give you more anyway. Have a nice day." We have not done that in my 23 years, and I cannot believe we did it this year.

There are increases in here for the CIA. I have tried very hard many times to get that number open so we could at least tell people what we are spending for the Central Intelligence Agency. These are the guys who missed Carlos Salinas in Mexico when we were doing NAFTA, they did not know the Wall was falling down, they have been falling all over the place trying to find a mission. Every year they get more money, too. That is great. We have B-

2's in here which no one knows what to do with.

I could go on and on and on. I think this bill is pathetic, and I hope people vote "no."

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong—in fact, strong support would be too weak a term—I rise in fervent support of S. 1124, the Department of Defense authorization conference report. I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], and all members of the committee who have labored long and hard to achieve what I think is truly a bipartisan work product.

During the many weeks of debate over this legislation, one very important issue which was always bipartisan from the very beginning has been the provisions to significantly reform the procurement system of the Department of Defense and the civilian agencies in order to make the Federal Government a smart shopper, something it has not been accused of being in my tenure here or for a long time before that.

The provisions that are in this bill are consistent with H.R. 1670, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995, which was a joint initiative of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on National Security. Those measures passed the House by a vote of 423 to 0 in September of last year.

The private sector continues to increase its productivity and its effectiveness in this whole area because they are not bound down by the arcane, convoluted Rube Goldberg type of provisions that the Federal Government has to operate with in its procurement system. It is a centrally planned system as it exists, expensive to operate, and heavily laden with paperwork requirements and bureaucracy. Piecemeal reforms just have not done the job. Today's system forces taxpayers—and this is the significant point, Mr. Speaker—forces taxpayers to pay a 20-percent premium on Federal purchases; on all Federal purchases, from fighter aircraft to office supplies, we are paying a premium of 20 percent, which this bill is going to go a long way toward correcting.

This agreement provides reforms needed to make DOD and the civilian agencies smart shoppers, as I said. The conference agreement promotes affordable and commonsense approaches to meet our budgetary goals by, among other things, providing for the increased use of commercial items, increasing the competitiveness of U.S. defense products in international markets, eliminating numerous government-unique procedures, and creating a whole new system for the purchase and

management of Federal information technology.

Mr. Speaker, this is a marvelous bill. It is a tremendous reform of our procurement system. It is the one thing we can do today that can save more money than almost anything else we do.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the previous speaker, was the cosponsor on the individual original bill, the acquisition bill, and did yeoman's work in getting it through. He deserves a lot of credit for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], chairman of our Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I commend him for his outstanding work on making sure we brought this work product on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and urge its adoption.

This conference report is good for our military personnel and good for their families.

This measure enhances force readiness. It fully funds the operations and training accounts and provides additional resources to other important readiness activities. It also protects these training and readiness accounts by establishing short-term financing mechanisms to pay for the initial costs of unfunded contingency operations.

This measure contains a number of provisions which improve the quality of life for our service personnel and their families. Additionally, this conference report contains reform measures to generate efficiencies in order to maximize limited defense resources.

Our military personnel put it on the line daily to provide for this Nation's security. They do so willingly and with pride. We must keep faith with them and their families.

We owe it to our troops to adopt this conference report today. The President owes it to our troops to sign this measure as soon as it reaches his desk.

This legislation is needed. Vote "yes" on this conference report.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1124, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

Last evening, the President stood at the rostrum and gave a nice speech. He talked about the challenges facing the country and he urged us to set aside our differences and work together for the best interest of the American people.

One of those challenges, he said, is "to maintain America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace

throughout the world." We all know that we can only meet this challenge by providing the Nation with a strong defense—a defense that can meet the threats posed by those who would challenge our interests and those of our allies or would threaten the liberties of our people.

Mr. Speaker, speeches and rhetoric are not enough. I regret that the President chose last month to veto the original defense authorization bill. That veto was unjustified. The original bill, like the one before us today, was a bipartisan product. Republicans and Democrats came together to provide the American people with what they expect—that is, a robust defense that could deal with any immediate threat and which looks to the future to deal with the emerging threats of the 21st century.

The President vetoed the bill principally because he objected to working toward a viable national missile defense by 2003 and to providing the American people with assurances that the placement of American military personnel under the operational control of the U.N. is in the national security interests of the United States. On these issues, the President is out of step with a bipartisan majority of this House and, more importantly, with the American people. I remain committed to seeing these provisions enacted into law.

The President's veto put a lot at risk. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I can assure the House that we need an authorization bill. Over 9,200 military families will benefit from housing improvements this bill would authorize and 68 new barracks projects would begin this year. In addition to these 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. We are confronting a significant deterioration in military infrastructure. Without an authorization bill, none of these projects will go forward and the housing privatization initiative cannot proceed.

The military services, the men and women who serve in them, and the families who support them need this bill. It is my hope that the President will sign this defense authorization bill as soon as it reaches his desk. We should have no further delay.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of legislative history, I want to note the colloquy that I had with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, on December 15, 1995, concerning sections 2836 and 2837 of H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996. In our colloquy concerning those provisions, I gave the gentleman from Illinois some clarification concerning the application of those provisions to the Glenview Naval Air Station, Glenview, IL. Although the President vetoed that legislation, those sections were unaltered in the subsequent conference with the Senate on the

defense authorization bill, S. 1124. Sections 2836 and 2837 of S. 1124 are identical to the provisions in the earlier bill and my assurances to the gentleman from Illinois remain unchanged.

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

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, even though critically important language on the U.N. or foreign command of U.S. troops and the deployment of this critically needed national missile defense system and contingency funding, all those are out, and Mr. Clinton is going to pay a heavy price during the next 286 days for that, I am very proud to stand up here and defend our chairman and this great authorization bill.

Among the important personnel provisions included in the bill that I authored or fought for as the chairman of the Subcommittee on military personnel are prohibition against all abortions in overseas or U.S. military hospitals, mandatory discharge of all nondeployable, noncombat trainable AIDS virus carrying drug users, and others, excellent new guidelines for accountability of American POW-MIA's, finally, a 5.2 percent interest pay raise in housing allowances, a cost of living adjustment, COLA, for military retirees, and a pay equity adjustment.

Among the other provisions I have championed as a member of the full committee or the Committee on Research and Development are increased funding for Navy upper tier ballistic missile defense, key; increased funding for more Army Kiowa OH-58D helicopters and for the Comanche RAH-66 Scout helicopter of the future; conditions on aid to Nunn-Lugar type money to Russia, pending a screeching verifiable halt to Russian work on the evil biological weapons; increased funding for near-term precision guided weapons for the B-1 Lancers; increased funding for new unmanned aerial vehicles, UAV's. I witnessed them in operation 4½ months ago in the Balkan theater, flying over Bosnia from Albania. Now it is all out in the open press.

Mr. Speaker, I believe those provisions that were cut out by Clinton's demands, he is playing high-risk. We saw his last State of the Union last night because American citizens want this beloved homeland of ours to be protected from rogue missiles, whether they are packed with nuclear devices, biological, or evil chemical warfare.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, last night we heard two speeches about priorities and values. The Senate majority leader said, and I quote, "The President claims to em-

brace the future while clinging to the policies of the past." Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at this legislation. This bill is clearly an improvement over the one that we worked on before, and I commend the conferees for their hard work, but the Republicans claim this bill, like the one before it, embraces the future of the U.S. defense policy. But the U.S. defense will not sail smoothly toward the future, because this bill is anchored by the policies of the past.

The Republicans speak of the need to balance budgets, cut fat, make difficult choices, but the Republicans are not making these difficult choices in defense. This bill does not make cuts, it gives the Pentagon \$7 billion more than they asked for. The Republicans speak of the need to strengthen this country's defense.

□ 1430

The Department of Defense will grow stronger when it is allowed to become leaner, more efficient and equipped for the challenges in a new world order.

This bill, however, builds up programs that the Department of Defense was moving away from, like the B-2, the ballistic missile defense, and the cuts in the Department of Defense environmental cleanup programs. We are closing military bases all over the country, realizing that the Federal Government is one of the biggest polluters, and we are not providing the money to clean up those sites.

The Republicans speak of supporting our men and women in uniform, yet this bill requires a discharge of service personnel with HIV, and prohibits members of the military from obtaining abortions in our military facilities overseas. Risking the health of our military, and needlessly taking away their careers, will hardly build morale.

As Americans watch this bloated defense budget pass this Congress, they will realize which party is really tethered to the past.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the chairman of our MWR panel.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Let me add my words of appreciation and congratulations to the chairman of the full committee for his very effective work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the National Security Committee's Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation, I rise in strong support of this bill.

The conference report fully funds important military quality of life programs including family support, child care, commissaries, gymnasiums and other recreational programs and facilities. These programs are critical to ensuring that our military personnel are taken care of, especially considering the sacrifices demanded of them in places.

The conference report makes a big contribution to caring for military personnel while on deployments and to the

families who must experience the difficulties associated with this high personnel tempo. Also, special efforts were made in this bill to ease the burden on these programs that resulted from the reduction of forces in Europe.

These quality of life improvements are a direct investment in readiness because they aid in retaining quality people in our Armed Forces. This bill represents a commitment by the American people in return for the sacrifices we demand of our men and women, in uniform each and every day.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this worthy legislation.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this authorization conference report was supported by 48 to 3, 48 to 3. To be fair, it probably would have been 48 to 4, but the gentlewoman from Colorado did not think enough to show up to vote, and she calls this bill pathetic. Maybe if it was that pathetic she would show up and vote in the report.

The President, in his 1993 budget, cut military COLA's. In a bipartisan way, this committee restored COLA equity for our military. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? In the President's last budget, he cuts COLA equities once again, and this is the last chance to protect those in this particular bill.

Let us talk about HIV. I had two people in my squadron who had HIV. They could not deploy, I could not use them, they had to be tied to the hospital. I could only tell my executive officer and the flight surgeon, which meant a risk for other people in that unit. With the limited and cut-back funds, we need full up-rounds in our units.

This also doubled the deployment time on shore duty of our military at a time when they are supposed to be spending it with their families.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, as a supporter of the original conference report, I would like to express my strong support for this new and improved version of the 1996 Department of Defense conference report.

This legislation, as my colleagues well know, is critical both to the functions of the Department, as well as to the men and women in uniform, who diligently serve this Nation. As has been stated time and again, this conference report provides a 2.4-percent pay raise, increases family housing, improves health care for military dependents, and funds overdue COLA equity for military retirees.

While the original conference report garnered the support of both the House and Senate, the President vetoed the measure. Chairman SPENCE has brought back to this House a conference report that adequately deals with the President's concerns, while carefully balancing the priorities of this Congress.

I believe this effort to build a consensus between congressional leadership and the administration is sound and once again merits the support of the House.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will vote this bill down. We are going to balance the budget. We are going to severely limit Federal spending. If you spend military dollars at the rate that this bill calls for, you inevitably will diminish substantially our ability to clean up the environment, to provide medical care for people who need it, to help provide public safety in our cities, to help deal with education for middle-income and working class students. There simply is not enough money to do both what this bill would do and that.

Fortunately, the gentleman from California who heads the minority on this committee has articulately and eloquently over the years, and again today, pointed that out; and that leaves me free to focus on one of the most obnoxious aspects of this bill. I admire the fact that the President singled it out when he originally vetoed it. I am very disappointed that it survives.

That is the legislation that says, if you are a young man or woman who volunteered to serve your country and you contract a terrible illness, the illness of being HIV-positive, your country will reward your volunteering and your good service by kicking you out. Any service you have accumulated will count for nothing if you are not eligible for a pension.

Fortunately, the Senate intervened a little bit to temper the gratuitous cruelty of the House bill to say that you should at least get some medical benefits. But cruel it remains.

What it says is, if you are someone who volunteered to serve your country, volunteered to join the armed services, but you become seriously ill with HIV, we will treat you as callously and as coldly as it is possible for a society to treat you. Out you will go. Out you will go. People who said, well, that about their ability to do things.

The military now has the power to say, you have reached the point of disability, you must leave. This means that well before that point people who are HIV-positive will be subjected to this incredible, callous cruelty, and it means that there will be no chance that the military now has to reassign people, to make use of their talents while they are still in a healthy phase. The military has a knack for this. It is an example of bigotry that dishonors this House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Jacksonville, FL [Mrs. FOWLER], a new and very valuable member of our committee.

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the revised DOD authorization conference report.

It is unfortunate, but telling, that the original conference report was vetoed over requirements that the President move toward deployment of national missile defenses by 2003, provide a national security certification before U.S. forces are placed under U.N. command, and seek supplemental funding prior to beginning contingency operations. As a result, this bill has been modified. I believe the original provisions served the interests on the American people well—especially with regard to antimissile defenses, which are nonexistent today.

Nevertheless, passage of this bill remains vital. Critical military readiness, force modernization, and quality of life issues cannot be addressed without it.

In particular, it provides military members with a full pay raise and increased housing allowances, it increases funding for training and maintenance, it pursues needed research and procurement to ensure our military's modernization, and it reforms pentagon acquisition policies. I also note that it spells out some very important changes in DOD maintenance and repair policies.

This bill is an excellent one. Chairman SPENCE and the members of the conference committee have done a good job, and this bill merits our strong support.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

As the ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I am proud of key elements of this bill which affect the military construction program and focus on improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families.

This bill would provide both short- and long-term solutions to a critical problem that impacts the retention and readiness of our Armed Forces.

By focusing on improvements to troop and military families, and setting strict priorities within the military construction program, we ensure that the housing backlog is addressed and quality of life is improved.

Furthermore, the bill includes a series of new authorities which would encourage the private sector to develop housing for unaccompanied personnel and military families at installations where there is a certified shortage of quality housing.

This initiative has strong bipartisan support, including the support of the Secretary of Defense.

This bill is not perfect, but it is a good bill that places priority on improving readiness and the quality of life programs that impact our personnel and their families.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

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

I would ask the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] to join me in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] and I are among several Members of Congress who have been seriously concerned about the administration's proposal to retire almost one-third of our Nation's B-52 force. I am pleased that the conference report prohibits the Department of Defense from retiring or preparing to retire any B-52H's in fiscal year 1996. The committee directs the Air Force to retain in an attrition reserve status the 28 B-52H bombers that would otherwise be retired.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement again to further explain the committee's intent with regard to the number and status of B-52's to be maintained under this bill.

Mr. HUNTER. The B-52 is still our Nation's most capable and only dual-role bomber and provides substantial conventional firepower and a strong nuclear deterrent. The committee believes that maintaining the current inventory of 94 B-52's is a cost-effective investment in our Nation's defense.

Accordingly, the committee report directs the Air Force to retain in attrition reserve the 28 B-52's programmed for retirement in the Department of Defense budget request. With the funds authorized under the bill, the committee expects the Air Force to keep the 28 attrition reserve aircraft at their current operational B-52 bases, maintained ready to fly and cycled through the active squadrons.

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the chairman for providing his leadership and for this important clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to compliment both the chairman and the gentleman from Kansas for their efforts to support a long-range bomber force that meets our mission requirements, and for this very important opportunity to clarify congressional intent relative to B-52's.

It is the directive of this authorization bill that the full fleet of 94 B-52's will be retagged. This is vital because it is our most versatile, cost-effective and only battle-tested bomber.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr.

SPENCE] for his leadership on this bill. I wanted just to confirm what we have discussed earlier with respect to the ballistic missile defense that is so important to the national security of our country, and that even though we have obviously lost this opportunity to build that up in this bill, that it is the intention of the Committee on National Security to move forward as one of its top priorities to have hearings on a national missile defense system and do that in the second term of the 104th Congress.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to assure the gentleman that we are going to revisit this question. It is a very important question. The people of this country do not realize that we are not defenders right now against intercontinental ballistic missiles, and when they find out, as they have found out, many of them, that we are not defended properly, they become very much concerned and want to know why.

We are going to have hearings. At some time during this next year, we are going to point this problem up even further, and I assure the gentleman that we will go into great detail in promoting this new initiative next year.

□ 1445

Mr. HOKE. I really appreciate that. As the gentleman knows, I am the author of H.R. 2483, the Defend America Act. I appreciate the gentleman's support on that, and especially in light of this veiled threat from Chinese officials. I think it is terribly important that we move this forward. I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] who is chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations, a very valuable Member of this House and a very strong supporter of national defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as I rise in support of this conference report, I want to say a special word about the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman FLOYD SPENCE. Chairman SPENCE and the gentleman from California, Mr. DELLUMS, and I came to the Congress together in the 92d Congress. We were all assigned to the Committee on Armed Services and we have all worked closely together since that time in behalf of our Nation's security and those who provide the Nation's security.

In the last year since the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and I assumed our respective chairmanships, we have worked together on a daily basis, and I think in an unusual partnership between authorizers and appropriators that does not always happen here. I want to compliment the gentleman. I know the rigors and the trials that the gentleman has gone

through in order to get us where we are today with a good conference report on a good defense authorization bill, and one that I understand even the President is prepared to agree to.

The gentleman deserves a tremendous amount of credit for the contribution that he has made to our national defense effort over all these years and in bringing this particular bill to us today. I compliment the gentleman and appreciate our friendship and professional relationship.

One of the items in this bill is something that most of us have been concerned about, and that is what we refer to as COLA equity for retired military personnel. We thought we had this problem of equity corrected several times during the year, but each time the arrangement fell apart. But Chairman SPENCE stuck to his guns in this bill, and I would like to announce this to the 323 of our colleagues who have cosponsored H.R. 2664, to accomplish COLA equity for our retired military. This bill does what 2664 intended to do, and I thank the chairman and ranking member for including it and insisting that it be included in this bill. Hopefully the President will understand the importance of that and will sign this bill and let it become law.

Again, I appreciate the working relationship that our two committees have had, our respective members and staffs have had, a good working relationship to provide for the security of our Nation, the well-being of those who serve us in the uniform of the United States, and to get the best deal we can for the taxpayer who has to pay for it all.

Mr. Speaker, there were very many things I found disturbing about President Clinton's first budget enacted in 1993. There were the new taxes, the increase in the Social Security earnings limitation, real cuts in Medicare spending, and the failure of the President to seriously address the deficit. However, nothing in that budget seemed more outrageous than to treat our Nation's retired military personnel as second-class citizens when it came to their retirement pay.

As one of this Congress' strongest advocates for those who serve and have served in our Nation's Armed Forces, I found it deplorable that the President and the Congress would ask those who have sacrificed so much for this country to bear an unfair burden in efforts to reduce the deficit. In fact, I would argue at length with anyone who suggests we should delay cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] to military retirees as a means to help balance the budget. But I will fight to the bitter end against those who would do so while treating other Federal retirees differently. Unfortunately, this was exactly what the President's budget did as civilian retirees and military retirees were set on different COLA schedules all in the name of deficit reduction.

Many of us in this Congress and throughout our Nation have been engaged in the battle for equity between civilian and military retirees since then. Fighting along side national and local veterans and military organizations we began in opposition to the President's 1993 budget. Then, 2 years ago we fought and succeeded in eliminating the disparity in 1995 by providing funds for an April COLA.



Last year, while the President refused to include language in his budget request repealing the COLA changes, the Congress took its own action by restoring equality in the 1996 Defense authorization bill. Although the President vetoed this bill, the legislation we consider today will again ensure that military retirees receive their COLA's in April of this year, and in January in 1997 and 1998, the same dates that civilians will receive their COLA's.

Since this Congress began more than a year ago, the new leadership of this House has made it a priority to end the inequity visited upon our Nation's military retirees by that 1993 budget. When our efforts to solve this problem in November became bogged down in the politics of a balanced budget and the 1996 Defense Authorization bill had stalled, I introduced a free-standing bill, H.R. 2664, to restore parity between military and civilian COLA's. In 4 legislative days more than 250 Members of Congress cosponsored this bill. Today there are over 320 cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as press reports indicate that the Secretary of Defense will recommend the President sign this new defense measure, supporting the conference report will be a major step toward restoring fairness to the way we treat both military and civilian retirees. I urge every one of my colleagues in the House to support the legislation before us today and help bring a successful conclusion to our efforts to end this inequity once and for all. Let's treat our military retirees with the fairness, dignity, and respect they so rightly deserve.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I heard the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] talk eloquently about the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the contributions that the two of them have made to this bill, I think it is important to also recognize the contributions that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member on Armed Services, has made to this whole process. The gentleman from California not only served his country in the call to the military, but has served for many, many years on this committee and was chairman of this committee and has very strong disagreements with the priorities that have been set. Yet, nevertheless, as chairman of the Committee on National Security, there is no one who took a bigger hit in his own district than the gentleman did in trying to downsize the military of this country.

I think it is interesting, last evening perhaps the greatest applause line that we heard was in the notion of ending the Lyndon Johnson big Government programs. It was not applause that just came from this side of the aisle; it came from the Republican side of the aisle. Yet the first bill that we bring up when we talk about downsizing Government, the first bill we bring up, adds \$7 billion more to the deficit of this country than the Joint Chiefs of Staff in all of their wisdom requested of the Congress of the United States.

They did not request the number of B-2's, they did not request the number of F-22's. Everyone who studies those issues knows those are not the aircraft we need in order to deal with the threat that the United States of America faces today. I am in favor of a strong national defense, the gentleman from California is in favor of a strong national defense, but not a wasteful national defense.

Mr. Speaker, there are homeless people on the streets of our country, housing residents that came and stood on the steps of this Capitol just yesterday, whose budget has been cut by \$7.5 or \$8 billion without a hearing, the same level of overspending that is occurring in this bill. Why is it that we have a country that wants to overspend on national defense, go beyond what is recommended by the greatest experts in this country, and yet go ahead and cut the most vulnerable people in this country? We go out and not only cut the housing budget, but we cut the homeless budget as well.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is time for us to have a country that looks forward and recognizes that by investing in our people we can have a strong national defense and a strong society as well.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I hope my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], will listen, because the Department of Defense budget is the only budget out of the entire U.S. budget that has been cut in real terms by over 10 percent in the past 5 years. When I first got to Congress, it was \$300 billion a year. This year it is about \$275 billion.

There are hundreds of thousands of young men and women who want to serve their country who have been involuntarily discharged or not had their contracts renewed because of downsizing. The point of the matter is the Department of Defense is smaller, and they are doing a better job with what they have.

I want to compliment the chairman and ranking member for doing the best job that we could with the funds that we have. I want to encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill. It is our job to decide where that money should be spent, and without this bill, the President will make that decision, not us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, let me say very quickly to my distinguished colleague from Mississippi that the \$275 billion is against the backdrop of \$300 billion a year that began during the Reagan era, when this military budget skyrocketed from \$173 billion, went up

well over \$200-some odd, and leveled out at \$300 billion during the decade of the 1980's. So I would remind my colleagues, compared to what? We never should have been spending \$300 billion a year on the military budget. To now spend \$275 billion a year in the context of the post-cold-war world, when there is no Soviet Union and when there is no strategic threat out there to the United States, is an appalling statement.

I would finally like to conclude with this on a very personal note. I take great pride, Mr. Speaker, in not attacking Members of Congress on this floor. If we want to debate, I am prepared to debate anybody in the Chamber on the substantive issue. That is my job and responsibility. I would simply admonish my colleagues that when we disagree, as ardently and as emotionally as we disagree, we should never call into play the motives of any individual Member or we should never challenge any individual Member of Congress, particularly when they are not there to defend themselves. I think we ought to be about our business with a much more dignified fashion. I think when we elevate the level of the debate to substance and policy and priorities, we are at our highest and best. When we reduce ourselves to personalities, it seems to me that is when we are not reflecting the best face of the most deliberative body in the world.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of the Members on the Committee on National Security and all the staff for the hard work they have done over a long period of time. On both sides of the aisle we have done our job.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and I came to Washington, at the same time, as has been mentioned a while ago. We come to the table sometimes from different perspectives, but we have gotten along over the years. Mr. DELLUMS was chairman the last time and I was ranking member. This time the situation is reversed. I have always enjoyed our working relationship. I believe very strongly in what the gentleman believes in, and that is he is to express himself and maintain his position. He does it very well, better than anybody I know, as a matter of fact. I respect him for that.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report started out a good while ago as a bipartisan effort on our committee. We got a good vote out of our committee in the very beginning. I think by the vote we will have today we will show this will be a bipartisan effort again.

But I want to remind my colleagues, as I said earlier, we still revisit two very important questions, national missile defense and the U.N. command and control of our troops. These things

will be revisited in the future, and people will have a chance to express themselves at length.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

This bill is virtually identical to the defense authorization the Congress approved last month. The bill was unacceptable then and remains so today.

Like its predecessor, the defense authorization before us today calls for spending \$7 billion more than the amount requested by the Secretary of Defense. Like the first defense authorization, this bill contains \$493 million to begin procurement of additional B-2 bombers—a plane the Defense Department insists it does not need.

In fairness to the bill's authors, the conference report before us drops the requirement that the United States deploy a national ballistic missile defense system by the year 2003. I applaud this change. There is serious doubt as to whether an effective missile defense system could be ready for deployment in 7 short years. Surely it makes more sense to continue our program to develop an effective missile defense system before we prematurely mandate its deployment.

In addition, deployment of a national system would almost certainly violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, perhaps with the result of jeopardizing continued Russian implementation of real arms reductions called for by the START I and START II treaties.

The bottom line is that this defense bill spends billions more than necessary on weapons we do not need. For this reason, I will vote against it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are considering today does not fit the direction we should be taking in the post-cold-war world. Excessive spending on weapons systems that are not needed is not the path to security. At the same time as it provides improvements for the quality of life for our soldiers, this bill also contains punitive provisions targeting HIV-positive personnel. But more importantly this measure does not provide guidance or proper policy for the mission of our forces today much less tomorrow.

Our 20,000 troops in Bosnia are there to monitor a peace agreement, to provide for the growth of peace. Despite the contrary objections, our troops in Bosnia are engaged in a clearly defined mission. In this effort our allies are assisting. Some of the most strident critics of Bosnia voice no objection to the out on sync policy regarding the long time deployment and stationing of United States troops and sailors abroad. This bill certainly does not address the issue of burden sharing or the basis for such U.S. commitments. With the end of the cold war, our role in Europe and around the world has changed greatly. We no longer need to fear a massive attack from Communist forces. Yet the troops sent to Europe during the cold war remain there with no significant redefinition of our role, literally 100,000 U.S. troops, men and material, deployed as if the world has not changed. We shoulder the burden of defense for other regions and countries with the attenuate expensive defense bills, spending on unnecessary planes, helicopters, and ships. We urgently need to realistically reassess this situation, particularly as cuts are sought in programs which help the American people. At home military bases are closed, with significant sacrifice

by many communities, but abroad the same rules and sacrifice are not advanced.

We need to reexamine the way we deploy and operate our forces in the world. We need to define their mission for today and tomorrow as has been done in the Bosnian operation with just a 1-year mission. Our allies must assist further with the heavy lifting involved with providing them security. Clearly military spending should not be increasing while other necessary programs are deeply cut.

This bill authorizes the spending laid out in the Defense appropriations bill. While a mandated antimissile defense system was removed from the bill, the billions of added dollars in spending, dollars that the Pentagon did not request, remains in the measure. The shift to national missile defense is still contained in this bill. B-2 planes not requested by the Pentagon are authorized, \$493 million more than was requested. Other new planes and weapons systems are also included, contrary to our needs in the view of the Pentagon. This new spending is not necessary and if we reassessed our security relationships with our allies, if we shared this defense responsibility more equitably, even more dollars could be taken from these accounts. But the fact is that even after the Pentagon has stated its opposition to numerous programs, a small miracle in and of itself, this 104th Congress beats its chest on budget balancing while lavishing dollars on pet projects rather than asking the tough questions that the tenor of the times and balancing the budget would demand.

While the spending on weapons systems increases, important programs do not get adequate funding. The legacy of our struggle in the cold war must be addressed. Environmental cleanup of military bases, arsenals, and damage from the production of nuclear weapons need to be carried through. Yet this bill reneges in this measure, providing \$280 million less than what is needed to accomplish the job of environmental cleanup. We should not leave this problem for future generations, an environmental deficit is equally unacceptable. These environmental hazards are real people security problems, where there should be no question of our mission.

The legislation before us muddles our defense missions. It does not reflect a proper assessment of what we should and need to do. Congress can and should do better. Our allies need to know that we expect them to accept responsibility for their defense. The cold war is over and the ability and role of the United States has changed but much in this measure reflects business as usual. We can not afford business as usual. I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong objection to two specific elements contained in the fiscal year 1996 Defense authorization conference agreement.

First, I must take strong offense to the suggestion that the members of our armed services, who have served our country honorably through times of war and peace, should be discharged merely due to contracting HIV. Military personnel must be judged on their ability to perform their assigned duties. Retaining service members who test positive for HIV but demonstrate no further evidence of illness should not be revised due to a flagrantly political agenda. Discharging experienced soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen merely for their

testing positive for a virus is a patently inequitable action is clearly based on a prejudicial attitude towards HIV. Further, we owe it to the American people to not add fuel to the fire of hysteria concerning HIV. If otherwise capable of performing their duties, our servicemembers deserve the right to continue defending our Nation.

Second, this conference report denies military personnel or dependents the right to obtain safe, legal abortions at overseas U.S. military facilities, except in cases of incest, rape, or danger to the life of the mother. I must ardently protest the denial of a basic constitutional right to the military women who so diligently protect our vital national security interests by serving overseas. Servicemembers deserve the very best we have to offer, in all regards. We simply cannot deny them the very same civil rights we grant every other American, the rights they are sworn to defend with their lives. Anything less would be to reduce military women to the rank of second-class citizens.

The members of the armed services perform a necessary and vital function in defending our national interests and our liberty. Just as they struggle to protect our Nation, we must endeavor to protect their fundamental human rights.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference agreement. The majority conferees may have reached an agreement with the President. In fact they eliminated several objectionable proposals like national missile defense, and limitations on the President's ability to engage in contingency operations. However, these changes are cosmetic. The overall levels of funding are still higher than last year's levels. The bill still authorizes \$7.1 billion more than the President's request. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will tell you how much this report does for military personnel to improve their lives. Well, I rise to tell you what it does to military personnel.

First, this conference report violates the rights of women on military bases around the world by forbidding them to exercise their right to have an abortion they pay for themselves.

Second, this conference report discriminates against people who are HIV-positive, by forcing the military to discharge HIV-positive personnel within 6 months of confirmation of their status.

They would be discharged regardless of their competence, or current health.

The Department of Defense objects to this policy, as a loss of valuable man-hours. DOD has its own criteria for medical discharge, and will release these people when they cannot perform their duty any further.

Not only does the bill burden military personnel, it also makes it harder to balance the budget in future years. For the first time in decades, we have begun departing from the "full-funding" principle. In past years, Congress requested that the total cost of a project is budgeted in the current fiscal year. In fiscal year 1996 we have paid for two destroyers, but authorized three.

The \$7.1 billion increase above the President's request is a token down payment on hundreds of billions of dollars shown the road.

Third, the B-2 bomber received an increase of \$493 million just to keep the production line open, even though the plane has yet to meet many of its mission requirements in flight testing. To actually purchase the planes would

cost us \$15 billion if we bought 20 more B-2's at a rate of 3 per year.

We cannot commit to this kind of spending and balance the budget. Vote "no" on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report, although I have serious reservations regarding one key provision. I am particularly concerned about the deletion of language from the earlier conference report limiting the President's ability to place U.S. troops under operational control of the United Nations [UN] until the President certifies to Congress that it is in the national security of the United States to do so.

It is unfortunate that the President chose to veto the entire defense bill over a common sense provision overwhelmingly supported by the American people. Later this year, I will be working with colleagues on separate legislation to incorporate this provision limiting U.N. command and control. I hope to see the day that our soldiers will no longer be put in harm's way under a flag of a foreign country, without their support.

However, I strongly support the provisions in this bill that finally resolves the COLA disparity between military retirees and Federal civilian retirees imposed by the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. This is great news to thousands of military Washington retirees who feel the same inflationary pressures as Federal civilian retirees.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Security Committee, I want the record to reflect my support for the fiscal year 1996 DOD authorization act. While I do not support every provision in this conference report, on balance it moves our military and our country in the right direction.

At a time when thousands of American men and women are deployed abroad in various peacekeeping and humanitarian missions, we must provide them with the support they need and deserve. This authorization includes improvements in basic pay allowances for military personnel, and cost of living adjustments for military retirees. It includes family housing units for Hanscom Air Force Base in Massachusetts to enhance the quality of life for military personnel and their families. It retains a commitment to the successful and battle-tested F/A-18 program and the Black Hawk helicopter program. It also contains language I authored to name a Navy ship after congressional medal of honor recipient Joe Vittori of Beverly, Massachusetts.

I would like to note, for the record, my opposition to the provision in this bill authorizing additional B-2 bombers, and language to promote a social agenda within our military. In committee, and on the House floor, I opposed the measure to ban all abortions in military hospitals and the proposal to terminate any Defense Department employee who tests positive for HIV. The Defense Department is capable of supervising and implementing its own personnel policies without unnecessary congressional intervention.

I voted for the DOD authorization conference report on December 15, when it passed the House the first time. I hope this important legislation will proceed through Congress as soon as possible and the President will sign it into law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 129, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—287

Abercrombie	Doolittle	Kasich
Ackerman	Dornan	Kelly
Allard	Dreier	Kennedy (RI)
Andrews	Dunn	Kennelly
Archer	Edwards	Kildee
Army	Ehrlich	Kim
Bachus	Emerson	King
Baessler	English	Kingston
Baker (CA)	Everett	Knollenberg
Baker (LA)	Ewing	Kolbe
Baldacci	Fawell	LaHood
Ballenger	Fazio	Largent
Barcia	Fields (LA)	Latham
Barr	Fields (TX)	LaTourette
Barrett (NE)	Flanagan	Laughlin
Barton	Foley	Leach
Bass	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Bateman	Ford	Lewis (KY)
Bentsen	Fowler	Lightfoot
Bereuter	Fox	Linder
Bevill	Franks (CT)	Lipinski
Bilbray	Frelinghuysen	Livingston
Bilirakis	Frisa	Longley
Bishop	Frost	Lucas
Bliley	Funderburk	Manton
Boehner	Gallely	Manzullo
Bonilla	Gekas	Martinez
Bono	Gephardt	Mascara
Boucher	Geren	McCollum
Brewster	Gilchrest	McCrery
Browder	Gillmor	McDade
Brown (FL)	Gilman	McHale
Brownback	Gonzalez	McHugh
Bryant (TN)	Goodlatte	McIntosh
Bunn	Goodling	McKeon
Bunning	Goss	McNulty
Burr	Graham	Meek
Burton	Green	Metcalf
Buyer	Greenwood	Meyers
Callahan	Hall (OH)	Mica
Calvert	Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Hamilton	Mink
Canady	Hancock	Molinari
Castle	Hansen	Mollohan
Chambliss	Harman	Montgomery
Christensen	Hastert	Moorhead
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Clinger	Hastings (WA)	Murtha
Clyburn	Hayes	Myers
Coble	Hayworth	Myrick
Coburn	Hefley	Neal
Coleman	Hefner	Nethercutt
Collins (GA)	Heineman	Ney
Combest	Herger	Norwood
Cooley	Hilleary	Nussle
Costello	Hobson	Ortiz
Cox	Hoke	Orton
Cramer	Holden	Packard
Crane	Horn	Parker
Crapo	Hostettler	Pastor
Creameans	Houghton	Paxon
Cubin	Hoyer	Payne (VA)
Cunningham	Hunter	Peterson (FL)
Danner	Hutchinson	Pickett
Davis	Hyde	Pombo
de la Garza	Inglis	Pomeroy
Deal	Istook	Porter
DeLauro	Jefferson	Portman
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Poshard
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Pryce
Dickey	Johnson, E. B.	Quillen
Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Dooley	Jones	

Radanovich	Skelton	Thurman
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Tiahrt
Richardson	Smith (TX)	Torres
Riggs	Smith (WA)	Trafficant
Roberts	Solomon	Visclosky
Rogers	Souder	Volkmer
Rohrabacher	Spence	Vucanovich
Ros-Lehtinen	Spratt	Waldholtz
Roth	Stearns	Walker
Salmon	Stenholm	Walsh
Sanford	Stockman	Wamp
Sawyer	Stump	Watts (OK)
Saxton	Talent	Weldon (FL)
Scarborough	Tanner	Weldon (PA)
Schaefer	Tate	Weller
Schiff	Tauzin	White
Scott	Taylor (MS)	Whitfield
Seastrand	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Shadegg	Tejeda	Wilson
Shaw	Thomas	Wolf
Shuster	Thompson	Young (FL)
Sisisky	Thornberry	Zeliff
Skeen	Thornton	

NAYS—129

Barrett (WI)	Gordon	Oberstar
Bartlett	Gunderson	Obey
Becerra	Gutierrez	Olver
Beilenson	Gutknecht	Owens
Blute	Hilliard	Pallone
Bonior	Hinchey	Payne (NJ)
Borski	Hoekstra	Pelosi
Brown (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Petri
Camp	(TX)	Rahall
Cardin	Jacobs	Ramstad
Chabot	Johnston	Reed
Chrysler	Kanjorski	Rivers
Clay	Kaptur	Roemer
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Roukema
Collins (MI)	Klecicka	Roybal-Allard
Condit	Klink	Royce
Conyers	Lazio	Rush
Coyne	LaFalce	Sabo
DeFazio	Lantos	Sanders
Dellums	Levin	Schroeder
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Dingell	Lincoln	Sensenbrenner
Dixon	LoBiondo	Serrano
Doggett	Lofgren	Shays
Doyle	Lowey	Skaggs
Duncan	Luther	Slaughter
Durbin	Maloney	Stark
Ehlers	Markey	Stokes
Engel	Martini	Studds
Ensign	Matsui	Stupak
Eshoo	McCarthy	Torricelli
Evans	McDermott	Upton
Farr	McInnis	Velazquez
Fattah	McKinney	Vento
Filner	Meehan	Watt (NC)
Flake	Menendez	Williams
Foglietta	Mfume	Wise
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Woolsey
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Wynn
Furse	Moakley	Yates
Ganske	Morella	Zimmer
Gejdenson	Nadler	
Gibbons	Neumann	

NOT VOTING—17

Berman	Oxley	Ward
Boehlert	Rangel	Waters
Bryant (TX)	Rose	Waxman
Chapman	Smith (MI)	Wyden
Chenoweth	Torkildsen	Young (AK)
Clement	Towns	

□ 1514

Ms. RIVERS and Mr. SHAYS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members