

was a Scripps Howard News Service story just yesterday, "Vandalism Rising At Veterans Cemeteries." Coincidental, Mr. Speaker, of course, to the passage of the bill today, but very pertinent in terms of asking the Members to support it. The story says, in part, "Lawmakers hope President Clinton will sign the bill into law on Veterans Day, on Tuesday."

I want to indicate that under the sentencing guidelines which I mentioned, in case it has not been made a part of the RECORD, it gives guidelines to the judges, directing them to increase the penalties for convictions of theft and vandalism at the national cemeteries. The measure before us would set prison terms for up to 10 years for anyone convicted of vandalism causing more than \$1,000 damage and up to 15 years for thefts at the national cemeteries.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by indicating that today we are voting to send that message that we will not forget the sacrifices made by those who made the ultimate sacrifice and that we will not tolerate further desecration of our Nation's cemeteries.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Veterans Cemetery Protection Act. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

This bill tightens penalties for any offense against properties of national veterans' cemeteries. Current statutes do not include any sentencing guidelines for theft, vandalism, or desecration of national cemeteries, only generic provisions against damaging Federal property.

In the wake of several incidents of theft, vandalism, and desecration, as has been enumerated by our colleagues today, at national cemeteries last year in California, Hawaii, New Jersey, and other States, I think it is appropriate that we penalize those who have perpetrated these acts of crime to deter this kind of reprehensible behavior. We owe no less to those who gave so much for all of us.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to join in support of this worthy measure.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 813.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN LEGION INCORPORATION TECHNICAL CORRECTION

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1377) to amend the act incorporating the American Legion to make a technical correction.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to Incorporate the American Legion", approved September 16, 1919 (41 Stat. 285; 36 U.S.C. 45) is amended by striking "December 22, 1961" and inserting "February 28, 1961".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1377, the Senate bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1377. This is a very simple bill. The purpose of the bill is to expand the American Legion membership eligibility dates for Vietnam-era veterans. It merely changes the dates within the confines of the American Legion Charter.

Under this bill, the commencement date of the Vietnam Conflict in the American Legion Charter will be defined as February 28, 1961, instead of the current date, which is December 22, 1961. February 28 is the date that United States Army advisers first accompanied South Vietnamese troops on patrols.

This modification tracks strictly the dates which the Veterans Administration uses in awarding benefits to Vietnam veterans. I wish to emphasize that the bill even changes the American Legion Charter and has no effect on any benefits paid to Vietnam veterans or any other effect. This bill will have no cost.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has adequately explained this bill. It is a very simple bill. It does something we certainly should do, to enable those American veterans who served in the Armed Forces after February 28, 1961, when the first American troops accom-

panied South Vietnamese troops on patrol, but prior to December 22, 1961, which is the current date in the current legislation in the incorporating charter of the American Legion, to enable them to join the American Legion. This does track the change Congress made for veterans' benefits. I hope that this bill is unanimously approved.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of S. 1377, the American Legion Membership Eligibility Act, which changes the date from which those persons may qualify for veterans' benefits through association with their service during the Vietnam war.

At present, anyone in the service on or before December 22, 1961, qualifies. This bill modifies that date of eligibility to February 28, 1961, and in so doing, codifies the Veterans Administration practice of using the earlier dates and expands the number of veterans eligible for various benefits and for membership in the American Legion.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation, which provides eligibility assistance to our veterans who served in the Vietnam war and who seek recognition by the American Legion.

I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for yielding me the time. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this measure to the floor at this time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of S. 1377. I have introduced an identical bill, H.R. 2835, which expands the Vietnam-era eligibility dates for membership in the American Legion. It is very significant that the House is voting on this veterans bill on the eve of November 11th, Veterans Day. Hopefully this great Nation can remember its veterans throughout the year, not only in November. The American Legion, founded September 16, 1919, is a great service organization and is well deserving of our full support. I urge a favorable vote on this important legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1377.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISAPPROVING CANCELLATIONS
TRANSMITTED BY PRESIDENT
OCTOBER 6, 1997

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 2631) disapproving the cancellations transmitted by the President on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105-45.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves of cancellations 97-4, 97-5, 97-6, 97-7, 97-8, 97-9, 97-10, 97-11, 97-12, 97-13, 97-14, 97-15, 97-16, 97-17, 97-18, 97-19, 97-20, 97-21, 97-22, 97-23, 97-24, 97-25, 97-26, 97-27, 97-28, 97-29, 97-30, 97-31, 97-32, 97-33, 97-34, 97-35, 97-36, 97-37, 97-38, 97-39, 97-40, and 97-41 as transmitted by the President in a special message on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105-45.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution of disapproval of the President's line item veto of the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill.

I would first like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS] for their leadership on this resolution. They are the ones who initiated the resolution, and without them it would not be possible for us to have this debate and action today.

Many of us have different reasons, Mr. Speaker, for supporting this resolution. First, some of us, myself included, are strong supporters of the line item veto. I continue to be even though we are asking for this disapproval resolution to be passed. This group may have the best reason of all to support this resolution of disapproval.

The President must use this new power very carefully, fairly, and responsibly. Otherwise, the line item veto becomes an abusive and dangerous power in the hands of the President.

□ 1415

Second, those strongly opposed to giving this power to the President in the first place and have argued that it is unconstitutional, you should vote for this resolution on principle alone. Your reasoning? The President should not have the line-item veto power in the first place and therefore he should not use it in this instance.

Third, some of us have had to explain to our service men and women back

home why their needs have been found less important than those of others and why they will not be getting the help they need this year. If you have any military construction projects in your State, and most States do, you should vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what category each of our Members would fall into, they should share the responsibility to ensure that the President uses his new authority fairly, carefully, and responsibly. The line-item veto authority can only be effective if it is used properly to cut wasteful and unneeded spending. This resolution is being considered in this House today because the President used his line-item veto authority in this instance carelessly and casually and then admitted that he made several mistakes.

Congressional Quarterly reported on October 31 the following: "The White House issued a veto threat, even as it acknowledged that it had used erroneous data as the basis for striking 18 of the 38 projects from the law."

In the White House press briefing shortly after the veto, OMB Director Franklin Raines said these exact words: "I believe that the great majority, if not the overwhelming majority, of these projects can make a contribution to our national defense."

Mr. Speaker, the fact is our committee did not pork up the appropriations bill, and because of that this administration is finding it harder and harder to defend its cancellations. My subcommittee produced a responsible and frugal bill. There is not a single project in the bill that was not completely scrubbed and carefully scrutinized by my committee, the authorizing committee and the Pentagon. Each and every project included was done with the full support and endorsement of the Defense Department. The facts are each of these projects meet a validated military requirement. Each of these projects is executable in this fiscal year, and this bill is within the amounts provided for defense under the budget agreement signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, nobody should claim that this bill contains unnecessary spending or is laden with pork. In fact, the contrary is true. Let me remind my colleagues that the bill we produced this year was \$610 million less than last year's enacted level. This is a 7 percent cut. Out of an \$11.2 billion budget level 2 years ago, the fiscal year 1998 appropriations bill is \$2 billion less. That reduction is over 20 percent in 2 years. The fact is if every other spending bill in the Congress was cut proportionately, we would not only have a balanced budget right now but a surplus of several billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, when the President finds wasteful and unnecessary spending, he has now the authority to cancel that spending, and he should use it. But when the President uses this power to cancel spending not because it is wasteful but for political or other rea-

sons, Congress should exercise its authority to disapprove of his actions. Today this Congress has the opportunity to correct the mistakes the President has admitted making.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee that authored the appropriations bill, I now ask my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval not just to provide the much needed resources for our service men and women but to ensure that the line-item veto power is used fairly, carefully, and responsibly in the future. The entire Republican and Democratic leadership team supports this resolution of disapproval. I strongly urge every Member of this body to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, let me at this time also thank some of the very key people that have been so instrumental not only in the movement of this bill but also of helping us in this resolution of disapproval. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, we have worked very closely with him; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], all of them have helped me. But more than anyone else, of course, is the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member and the former chairman of this subcommittee. He has been absolutely remarkable in his efforts to put together a good bill and to also help us to get bipartisan support in this resolution of disapproval. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the ranking member of the authorizing committee, also was very important in helping to craft and work with us on this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak about this particular bill. I was chairman of this subcommittee for quite a few years. In many instances we would pass this bill on a voice vote. We have prided ourselves in being a very bipartisan subcommittee. I would be remiss if I did not say that I think we have the finest staff on both sides, Democrats and Republicans, the finest staff anywhere in this House. They have done a remarkable job year after year after year to make sure that these projects are scrubbed, to make sure that there are no lightning rods in these bills. We have made a real effort to do the best that we could for our troops, our men and women in the service, and to help our Nation's defense by having people that would resign and reup and keep our military strong, and to keep our families intact where they would have a decent place to live and exist.

I would say the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] made my speech. I had a nice speech here. I would be happy to send all the Members copies. But I would say this. I have the privilege of serving on two committees. I

serve on the Subcommittee on Military Construction that I was chairman of for a lot of years. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I have been very good friends for many years. I would say that I do not know of a finer, more dedicated Member in this House than the gentleman from California.

I also serve on the Subcommittee on National Security. I can equally say the same thing for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] who has been instrumental in adding health issues into the defense budget and a remarkable person in his own right. If we had the camaraderie in all the House that we have on this Subcommittee on Military Construction, I think life would be a little more pleasant for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that should not have been vetoed. I did not support the line-item veto. When the line-item veto bill was up, I stood in this well and I predicted what would happen on the line-item veto. I stick by those predictions. This is just the first part of the terrible things that can happen under line-item veto. I think some of my colleagues that voted for line-item veto would have a tendency to rethink at this point in time. This is a good bill. There are no lightning rods in it, there is no Lawrence Welk, there are no bicycle paths. This is a bill that stresses the quality of life for our men and women in service and training facilities.

The argument that was made that some of these projects were not ready to go, we have prided ourselves in making sure that any project that we fund would be ready to go in that fiscal year. For that reason, I strongly support the override of this bill and compliment the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], all the Members on the Democratic side, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and all the staff for putting this bill together. I would strongly urge a unanimous vote on overriding this veto.

Let me make one other point. In talking to people, they have said, "Well, I voted for line-item veto. I feel a little bit hypocritical about voting to override one of the first line items that was passed here." When Members signed up to support line-item veto, they did not sign up to support every time that a President, be he Democrat or Republican that would veto, they signed up to give the President some discretion to scrub the bills and make sure that there was no pork and waste in them. I do not think it is a bit hypocritical for anyone that supported line-item veto to support the override of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that everybody vote with us on overriding this line-item veto.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a certain sameness or similarities between what each of us that have worked so hard on these bills have to say, I think. I think that is because there has never probably in the history of the Congress been two appropriation/authorization committees that have worked closer together or have worked in a more bipartisan spirit than these committees have. I appreciate from the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] so much the ability for us to work together like we have. We had the same criteria. We worked hard on that criteria. We struggled to make sure that everything absolutely met that criteria. I think we were all absolutely dumbfounded when the President chose to veto these particular bills.

Let me sum it up again. All of these projects would address validated requirements of the military services. We did not invent any of these projects. We did not come up out of our head and say, "Oh, that would be nice to do." These are things we demanded that the military prove their need for before we put them in. They are based on information provided by the military departments when the legislation was being developed. All of the projects are executable in 1998—33 of the 38 canceled projects, 85 percent of them, are actually in the President's 5-year defense program. One in four were programmed by the administration for the fiscal year 2000 military construction program. The military construction appropriations and authorization bills were both within the limits established by the budget agreement. There is no wasteful or excessive spending here.

The White House and the Department of Defense both admit mistakes were made in the exercise of the line-item veto on the military construction propositions bill. To keep faith with the men and women in uniform and to improve their working conditions, their training environments and to enhance unit readiness, I believe the House should override the President's vetoes in this case.

The Line-Item Veto Act provides a process for reconsideration. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] said, innate in supporting the line-item veto, and I supported the line-item veto and I still support it, but innate in that process is the ability of this body to disagree with what the President's thoughts were by vetoing them. That is what I ask us to do today. Let us disagree with the President. The President and the White House have already admitted mistakes were made. I do not think he is out there struggling for Members to sustain this veto particularly. Let us band together and have a very strong vote to override these vetoes.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House in the last 2 years has offered more amendments to cut military spending than I have. I think that we spend an obscene amount on military spending. I think it ought to be cut back deeply. Last year I offered an amendment to this bill to cut a number of projects out which were not on the administration's 5-year plan. I had originally expected to oppose this resolution because I felt that justice might best be served by making the White House and the Congress live with the consequences of their action on the line-item veto. But I think the manner in which the White House has handled these line-item vetoes in recent weeks is an affront to responsible government and deserves the type of public repudiation that this resolution provides. It is true that Members of Congress sometimes add items to legislation that are inconsistent with the overall purposes of that legislation and items that serve purposes too narrow to warrant the use of public funds. The same I would say can be said of many of the proposals contained in each of the budgets of each of the six Presidents I have served under.

The question which the line-item veto raises was whether or not wiser decisions about the use of public funds could be made if the executive were given significant additional powers with respect to Government spending. I believe the experience we have had with the Clinton White House this fall answers the question. The President's exercise of the line-item veto has been objectionable for the following reasons in my view.

□ 1430

First, staff incompetence. With respect to military construction, the first appropriation bill on which the line item was fully exercised, fully one-third of the projects vetoed failed to meet the criteria established by the White House in the first place.

Second, executive arrogance. The criteria established by the White House displayed wanton disregard for the constitutional role of the Congress in making decisions about spending. They were not narrow-purpose items, they were of limited public use. In fact, the overwhelming majority were contained in the administration's own 5-year construction plans. The purpose of the veto, therefore, was clearly a matter of insisting on administration priorities in spending over those of the Congress. The White House may want the Government to work that way, but the Founding Fathers did not.

Third, political dealmaking. The White House has made it very clear from the outset that its use of the line-item veto is a matter of political discretion rather than objective policy. The Defense appropriation bill which contained nearly half of all discretionary spending and, in my view, more

than half of the items that might have demanded the most scrutiny in an objective application of the line-item veto, that bill was the subject of the first administration offer with regard to the line-item veto. On that bill conferees were told by the White House that they would exempt the defense appropriation bill from line-item vetoes altogether if the Congress added more money to fund the very questionable Dual Use Program which gives Government research grants to private for-profit corporations.

Fourth is the blatant disregard for eliminating the most wasteful items. While the White House has at times been willing to exercise the line-item veto on items where a clear public purpose was beyond dispute, they willfully neglected to use the veto in numerous instances where lack of a clear public purpose was beyond dispute.

What we clearly have here is an effort on the part of the White House to leverage greater political power to the executive branch carried on under the guise of imposing fiscal restraint. But what the executive branch wants under this administration is no different than we have seen under previous administrations. They not only want more power, but they also very often want more money. And line item vetoes are being used to leverage in some cases more spending and to give the executive branch more leverage on non-spending items as well. I believe that is illegitimate.

The President is the most powerful office in the world, and as Americans we should be proud of that, but the President should not be too powerful. We elect him to be a President, not a king. In my lifetime the greatest abuse of powers of government have come from the executive branch. If the Congress does not maintain its constitutional responsibility to be a coequal branch of Government, we risk having a Government which increasingly abuses its own citizenry and in which decisions about policy and resources are dominated by unelected staff elites or only marginally subject to popular will.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I truly appreciate the statement that the gentleman from Wisconsin just made.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the passage of H.R. 2631, the military construction line-item veto disapproval bill. Passage of this legislation is necessary to correct the mistakes that were made during the President's vetoes of 38 projects included in

the bill which passed the House by a wide margin in July and in September.

I thank the leadership for allowing this bill to come to the floor for passage, and I am especially appreciative of the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member, for their work in shepherding this legislation on the floor.

One of my colleagues from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] has titled this bill the military construction line-item integrity bill as this legislation restores integrity to the line item-veto process by ensuring the decisions are made on the basis of fact and not mistakes. The Office of Management and Budget has acknowledged that mistakes were made which led to the President's line-item vetoes, and passage of the legislation would allow those mistakes to be corrected.

This bill has broad bipartisan support, and just yesterday the National Guard Association of the United States endorsed this bill. So I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support the legislation to ensure that our laws are based on factual information, not mistakes and erroneous information.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion of disapproval and commend the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] and others for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2631, the military construction veto disapproval. I have the privilege of representing Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, TX. One of the 38 projects stricken from the military construction projects was in my district so I have a very personal interest in this legislation, but I believe that the President made the decision to strike many of projects in the bill based on poor advice and inaccurate information.

One of the reasons the President gave for vetoing these projects was that they did not meet a so-called "quality of life" requirement. I don't know what the President's definition of quality of life is, but I do know this: these 38 projects which were eliminated included facilities to provide a safe working place for the men and women we entrust with the defense of our Nation.

In the case of the squadron operations facility to be built at Dyess Air Force Base, there are currently no existing facilities to house the 13th Bomb Squadron. Without this facility, the men and women of the 13th Bomb Squadron will be denied the tools they need to do their jobs.

How does this add to their quality of life or their ability to discharge their duties? Quality of life involves a great deal more than housing and child care facilities and gymnasiums, although those are very important. I cannot imagine how the quality of work life could be

much worse than importing 500 to 1,000 men and women to do a job without any facilities in which to house that work.

The projects line-item vetoed by the President were included in the military construction bill because they are essential to the mission of our military. Most of these projects were included in the 5-year plans of the military services so that the money for these projects will be spent eventually. These projects were considered by four different congressional committees with expertise in the area of national security and were reviewed by the Pentagon. The House and the Senate voted by overwhelming majorities to approve the Military Construction Appropriation Act.

Yet the President and his staff acting in haste crafted a new criteria for military construction projects—quality of life. While I do not oppose the use of quality of life as a consideration for determining the merit of a project, it should not be the only criteria, and it should be clearly defined and fairly applied. In the case of the 13th Bomb Squadron Operations Facility and many of the other projects canceled by the President, it was not. The President incorrectly substituted his judgment for that of the Congress and the Pentagon. I urge my colleagues to support our men and women in uniform by voting to override the President's line-item veto to restore these projects.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], who has done yeoman work on this bill and also on the authorization bill.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support H.R. 2631, the Military Construction Line Item Veto Integrity Act before this House today. As my colleagues know, we have done so much work these last few months. We have had some very interesting hearings trying to address the needs that we address when we had those hearings and included in the bills and in some of these items that were vetoed.

Now, the administration has admitted that they made some mistakes when they line item vetoed some of these projects. This is why today I strongly request my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

As my colleagues know, during these hearings that we had in reference to the military construction appropriations bills and the authorization bill, we traveled, and we saw the need. I wonder if my colleagues know that some of our pilots are getting out of the military after they serve 5, 6 years, and after we pay a million dollars to train our pilots they get out, and do my colleagues know why? It is because we have housing problems that now we are beginning to address in this bill today.

They tell me, as my colleagues know, we train, and then we are deployed two, three different times a year, and at the same time when we are fighting to keep peace in these countries where we are assigned, we have to worry about our families. Why? Because the

plumbing does not work, because the electricity does not work, and then we expect our service people to stay when they have to serve under these conditions. They get better job offers in the outside.

But let us not forget that included in this bill also, there is a pay raise for service men and women who serve, as my colleagues know, in the military.

Again, I want Members to also remember that this has to lead back on pension. We will one of these days regret that because we did not do what the servicemen, people, needs were never addressed, that they are going to be getting out of the military, and this is going to cost more money.

This is why I urge my colleagues to vote to override this bill today. It is a good bill, it is good for America.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to commend the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and all the others who have worked on this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say that I rise in strong support of this resolution to disapprove the President's line-item veto of the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill.

I rise in strong support of the resolution to disapprove the President's line-item veto of the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill.

Congressman SKEEN and I introduced resolutions disapproving the line-item veto of these 38 military construction projects. One of those projects—the construction of two vehicle maintenance shops totaling \$9.9 million—was to be built at Fort Campbell, KY, located in my congressional district.

But whether or not you have a project eliminated by this veto should not be your only concern.

What should concern you is the process.

Under the provisions of the Line Item Veto Act, the disapproval resolution is the only means we have to register our objection or dissatisfaction with the programs or projects targeted for elimination or the manner in which they were selected. I am very pleased that Chairman PACKARD and Ranking Member HEFNER support us in this effort.

Depending on which report you read, as many as 18 projects proposed for elimination in this line-item veto proposal should never have been included on the list, including the vehicle maintenance shops at Fort Campbell.

As a matter of fact, in testimony before the House National Security Committee on October 22, 1997, Maj. Gen. Clair F. Gill, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Budget, testified that the Fort Campbell project is 90-percent design complete, not zero percent as had been reported to the President. Since the President used the design status to determine which projects should be eliminated, he acted based on erroneous information. The bottom

line is a mistake was made, and the vehicle maintenance shops at Fort Campbell should not have been included in the list of vetoed projects.

I voted to give the President line-item veto authority, and I still believe it is an appropriate means to further reduce unnecessary spending.

But the decisions on which projects or programs should be eliminated should be based on the criteria defined in the line-veto message. That did not happen in this case.

Two units at Fort Campbell are scheduled to receive the new vehicle maintenance shops. The 235 soldiers assigned to those units currently work in facilities constructed over 50 years ago that were built to last for only five years. They are too small and improperly designed for efficient and safe maintenance activities. They have old and faulty electrical wiring which caused a fire in October 1991, destroying one building; they have inoperable and unserviceable vehicle exhaust systems; and they have inadequate lighting and are combustible. The current buildings contain asbestos and lead-based paint and they have no oil/water separators. Any way you look at it, the current maintenance facilities are deficient from an environmental, safety, and operational standpoint.

The soldiers who work in these buildings are responsible for repairing and maintaining 400 pieces of equipment each month. The work they perform is critical in terms of maintaining a premier fighting force like the 101st Airborne Division which is expected to fully deploy to any location throughout the world in only 76 hours.

Please join Congressman SKEEN and me in support of the disapproval resolution. The Senate has already voted 69 to 30 to reject this veto, and the House must take similar action. We need to protect the line-item veto process, and we need to restore funds to projects which met the President's criteria and did not belong on any veto list.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I rise in strong support of this legislation and suggest to my colleagues that this issue is not solely about 38 projects, as meritorious as those projects may be. It is about the proper balance between the Congress of the United States and the Executive.

I did not support the line-item veto. I supported the enhanced rescission alternative of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], which allowed the President to take out projects that the President thought were either fraud or wasteful or untimely or against the policy of the administration.

In this instance the administration acted far too broadly and far beyond those constraints. This legislation, therefore, in my opinion, seeks to address balancing the responsibilities of this Congress, which under article I of the Constitution of the United States is to set the policies for this Nation and the executive's authority to carry out, but also to ensure that those policies are perceived by the administration as not to be wasteful or against

policy. In my opinion, this veto went so broadly as to substitute the judgment of the administration for that of the Legislature, and that is not appropriate under the Constitution of the United States.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues not just because these 38 projects themselves have merit, but more importantly so that the proper balance between the executive and legislative branches of Government is focused upon by both the administration and by the Congress, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for his leadership and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for his leadership in bringing this matter before the Congress in a context which does not need to be critical of the administration, but simply to say as we try out this new procedure, and it is brand new, we need to make sure that we do so in a context that is judicious and proper.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this Line Item Veto Cancellation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me and I rise to express my support for H.R. 2631, the Line Item Veto Cancellation Act.

As a long-time supporter of the line-item veto, I was particularly disappointed to see the President make a misinformed decision in canceling funding for 38 military construction projects, including 2 in my home State of Idaho. Based on faulty and outdated information provided by the Department of Defense, President Clinton eliminated needed funds for a B-1B bomber avionics facility for low-altitude navigation and an F-15C squadron building for planning and briefing combat crews at Mountain Home Air Force Base.

Both of these projects were among the Air Force's top priorities and were a part of the President's 1999 and 2000 Pentagon budgets. The 366th Composite Wing at Mountain Home Air Force Base represents one of our Nation's premier rapid-deployment forces in times of an emergency. Even Defense Secretary Cohen has reflected on the critical role of the 366th Wing in our national security structure and acknowledged that "it must maintain peak readiness to respond rapidly and effectively to diverse situations and conflicts." For service at home and in the Middle East, Central America, and Europe, the men and women of Mountain Home Air Force Base have answered the call of their country; it is only right and proper that the Commander-in-Chief recognize this important commitment.

Providing the President with line-item veto authority was an important goal of the last Congress, and I was pleased to assist in that effort. However, this power is significant and must be practiced with great care and attention. It is my hope that the President understands this and will only exercise the veto in appropriate cases.

At this time, I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman PACKARD, Representative SKEEN, Representative HEFNER, and the

House leadership on both sides of the aisle for considering this measure today to overturn the President's vetoes. The Senate has already voted overwhelmingly to overturn the President's actions, so I hope that we can also send a strong message to the White House this afternoon by passing this measure with a veto-proof majority.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I voted for the line-item veto in 1995, and I remain a strong supporter of it when it is used properly. Unfortunately that is not the case here.

Now we have two problems. Problem one, the President vetoed worthwhile projects, not the kind of wasteful pork-barrel spending that we intended to eliminate with the line-item veto; and problem two, the administration now admits it vetoed dozens of projects by mistake. Now they say they want to work with Congress to restore the funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to correct these mistakes, and that is through this override process. When the President vetoes worthwhile projects by mistake, we have an obligation and a responsibility to correct those mistakes.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

I voted for the line-item veto in 1995, and remain a strong supporter of it when it is used properly. Unfortunately, that is not the case here.

We have two problems. First, the day after the President used the line-item veto, his budget director said this about the vetoed projects:

"The great majority, if not the overwhelming majority, of these projects can make a contribution to our national defense."

Problem 1. He vetoed worthwhile projects, not the kind of wasteful, pork-barrel spending we intended to eliminate with the line-item veto.

Problem 2. The Administration now admits it vetoed dozens of projects by mistake. They say they want to work with Congress to restore funding.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one way to correct these mistakes and that is through this override process.

When the President vetoes worthwhile projects by mistakes, we have an obligation and a responsibility to correct those mistakes.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES].

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of this bill.

I rise today in support of this bill to restore the military construction projects which were vetoed from the military construction appropriations bill.

Although I was not a Member of Congress when the line-item veto authority was passed and I do not necessarily support the line-item veto which I believe unfairly shifts the balance

of power in this government, I understand that the purpose of the line-item veto is, basically, to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary spending—pork.

The projects included in the military construction bill were not pork. As a Member of the House National Security Committee's Subcommittee on Military Facilities and Installations, I know how well each of the projects was vetted. All projects had to meet a need of the military and construction had to begin before the end of the next fiscal year. Even the Pentagon knows how important these projects are because most were included in its outyear budget plans.

When the President used his line-item veto on the military construction bill, his criteria included:

1. That the project could not make an immediate contribution to quality of life, or
2. That the project could not begin in fiscal year 1998.

First, in regards to the ability to begin construction in fiscal year 1998, both the military construction appropriations and authorizing subcommittees reviewed all the projects closely and verified with the military services that construction on each project could begin next year. The administration also has now admitted projects were vetoed based on incorrect information.

Second, many members of the House National Security Committee, including myself, find odd that the criteria did not include safety of our men and women in uniform and our civilian personnel. Many of the projects vetoed were, in fact, included in the original military construction bill for safety reasons.

For example, Congress has included an ammunition supply area to be located on McGregor Range at Fort Bliss. The soldiers of Fort Bliss fire live ordnance on McGregor Range which is about 20 miles from the main post. Some of the live ordnance is now stored on the range, however, much is still stored on the main post and must be transported to the range for use by the troops. On post, the ammunition is stored in buildings which do not comply with regulations designed to protect human safety and the environment. To deliver the ammunition to the range, soldiers transport the ordnance over public highways through low income and minority areas of El Paso.

Another project included in the bill for safety reasons is a project to renovate launch complex facilities on White Sands Missile Range. Our soldiers and civilians, currently working in this launch complex, are testing, among other munitions, antiballistic missiles to protect our troops in the field and the people of this nation. The 200 men and women who perform these tests, however, are working in unsafe and generally deplorable conditions. They face daily hazards relating to the absence of fire suppression systems and are potentially exposed to the dangerous hanta virus because of rat infestation under the buildings. Without the renovations to the launch complex, their health and safety are at risk and activities relating to many of this nation's future offensive and defensive weapon systems will be jeopardized.

I urge you to vote yes on this bill to help protect the lives and health of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and civilian personnel.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, as an appropriator and opponent of the Line-Item Veto Act, my comments will be somewhat counterintuitive.

You bet there is a mistake that needs to be corrected here. It was our mistake in passing the Line-Item Veto Act.

You bet we should be concerned for the prerogatives of the legislative branch; we gave them away.

Until we suffer the consequences of our profoundly foolish act in passing the line-item veto bill to begin with, it will be a continuing invitation for just the kind of abuse of executive power that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and others have pointed to.

We did this to ourselves. The only way we are going to come to our senses about our mistake is to have to suffer the consequences of that mistake.

We should vote no on this bill to force ourselves to live with what we did until we realize that we have it in our power to restore our constitutional rights. We gave them away. We cannot blame the President for taking advantage of that mistake.

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

□ 1445

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first let me strongly commend the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and everyone else for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, this is both a pro-defense and a pro-line item veto vote here today. The previous speaker is a good friend, a former Marine, but he is also the most outspoken opponent of the line-item veto, and I think he protests too much.

As a chief proponent of the line-item veto in this House, I am proud to say as chairman of one of the committees charged with the oversight of the line-item veto bill, I assure Members that such an action would be fully consistent with the intent of the line-item veto.

The line-item veto was written to give any President, regardless of party, the authority to highlight, in his opinion, questionable spending. Likewise, the law protects Congress' ability to defend its spending decisions and priorities by providing for this expedited procedure we have before us today.

Moving a bill which utilizes these procedures is in no way undermining the intent nor taints our strong support of the line-item veto.

Let me just tell Members something: If this does not pass today, we lower the level of spending by almost \$300 million, almost half a billion dollars. That lowers all the defense spending. We fight hard to maintain that level of spending.

I want everybody to come over here, those who supported the line-item veto, like I did, and I want you to vote to override the President. That is our prerogative as Members of this House.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2631, and I would urge everyone who supports our military to likewise support this legislation.

When this legislation originally passed, over 400 people in this body voted in favor of it, and I ask all 400 of them to vote the same way today. The reference is made that these projects are somehow wasteful and are pork-barrel kind of projects simply because they were not included in the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, each year I visit each of the military bases in my district and talk personally with the commanding officers and ask them what their priorities are and why their No. 1 priority is in fact their No. 1 priority.

In the case of my project that is in this bill, it is because it is a matter of safety, safety for our military people. This item is fully justified by all of the criteria that are established for military construction projects. It has met all these requirements, and I would say that the President made a grave mistake in striking this provision.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HOSTETTLER.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill of disapproval.

In 1995, the future years Defense plan showed that a chemical and biological testing facility was planned to be built at the Crane Naval Surface Warfare Center in fiscal year 1998—which is the Navy's designated agent for servicing and upgrading the chemical and biological weapon detection equipment deployed with the fleet.

Since Crane is in the district I represent, I spoke to the Navy about this construction.

I learned that the workload in this area was increasing dramatically and that the current facility would be hard put to handle the increase.

In 1996, this program slipped to fiscal year 1999.

This spring, I noticed that this project had slipped in the future years Defense plan to fiscal year 2000.

I found this disturbing in light of the hearings our committee was having.

For instance, on March 19, 1997, the Commander in Chief for the U.S. Central Command, General Peay, testified before the National Security Committee that, quote "The situation has worsened during the past twelve months, with Iraq, Iran and others in the Middle East aggressively . . . advancing their

chemical and biological research and development plans."

The Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan identified the capability for stand-off detection of chemical weapons as, quote "our single and most pressing need . . . critical to protecting our fielded forces."

The Chemical and Biological Testing facility was planned, necessary, and executionable.

The Congress was right to advance this project for our sailors.

The President made an error in vetoing it.

We should do the right thing again.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of the Committee on National Security.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2631, which restores funding for the 38 military construction projects canceled by the President last month.

By any definition, the projects canceled by the administration are not pork and they are not wasteful. The Committee on National Security recently conducted a hearing on the administration's proposed cancellations, and the record is clear.

First, each of the proposed cancellations meets a validated military requirement. Second, each of the 38 projects is executable in this fiscal year. Third, nearly all these projects, 85 percent, are in the administration's own defense program. Fourth, the \$287 million associated with these projects is well within the limits established by the budget agreement.

In addition, the administration readily admits that mistakes were made in the President's extensive exercise of the line-item veto on the military construction appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for the line-item veto. However, the veto power was given as a tool to be used to prevent unnecessary spending. Even the President does not contend that these projects were unnecessary.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat like the skunk at the garden party. I rise to support the line-item veto.

This body in 1996 talked long and hard about how we were going to share the sacrifice across the country to make the tough decisions to balance the budget. Indeed, there is light at the end of the tunnel now, and that is very encouraging. But the fact of the matter is, we cannot expect to reach the end of that tunnel, nor can we expect to maintain our resolve to balance the budget, unless the sacrifice is truly shared.

We have not yet developed in this House or in Congress clear rules that avoid situations where one part of the country feels that another part of the

country is walking away with special projects or special opportunities. There have been attempts to do this, but, continuously, whether it be by report language or earmarks in appropriations bills or other bills, the principle is violated.

I have worked with Senator MCCAIN and others to try to raise the standards in this respect. I know there are many others in this body that share that feeling. Otherwise, the line-item veto would not have passed by such an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is incumbent upon us to work with the White House to try to establish clear standards for, first, the use of the line-item veto, and, second, for our appropriations process, so that in the months ahead we do not see the line-item veto being exercised.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed almost to yield only 30 seconds to my next four speakers, the first of which is the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this disapproval bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California, Chairman PACKARD, for his very hard work, but most especially for his using the line-item process properly.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] got up and said we are here to condone the President's mistakes. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are here to correct the President's mistake with this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill. As one of the House's five majority conferees who secured final passage of the line-item veto, I am pleased to see the process we devised working. When the President first made use of his new line-item veto authority, naysayers and critics rushed to judgment and declared a falling sky. Those of us who support the line-item veto have repeatedly attempted to remind our colleagues that we did not go forward blindly in approving the line-item veto—that we carefully and painstakingly considered mechanisms to ensure that Congress would remain an integral part of the process. Today's consideration of a disapproval resolution on the President's cancellations from the fiscal year 1998 military construction spending bill underscores that fact. In this specific case, as all of us now know, the President has admitted making mistakes in applying the line-item veto to the military construction bill. By passing this disapproval resolution, we are giving the President a chance to correct those mistakes. We all know that there are lower priority and wasteful projects in spending bills that come out of the Congress. That's why we passed the line-item veto. But in this case, most of what the President chose to cancel through the line-item veto were projects that he himself has asked for. I am very concerned that we not continue to make funding for our troops

the easy target for spending cuts. National defense funding has already taken a disproportionate share of major hits under this President. For more than one reason the MilCon cancellations were a mistake; here's our chance to right that wrong.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction. I even had the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado, to go down to look at this project.

Let me just quickly tell you what was vetoed: A project that costs \$19.9 million in a figure for 1961; it would pay for itself, Navy figures, 2 years, 1 month, and deliver back to the taxpayers \$169 million in savings in 25 years. The computer printout, everything was there. It was vetoed. It should not have been vetoed. There were never questions asked by the Department of Defense. I would ask that we pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in responding to the President's decision to veto certain projects added to the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill—like Paul Harvey, I cannot pass up an opportunity to tell you "the rest of the story."

The waterfront improvements project at Norfolk Naval Shipyard is not a pork barrel project.

It's not part of some fly-by-night scheme to add wasteful, unnecessary spending to the benefit of only me or my district.

It was done in full light of day by authorizers and appropriators, first in the House and then in conference agreement with the Senate.

This project has been in the works since 1995. It is needed to make Norfolk Naval Shipyard more effective, efficient, and competitive.

The Project replaces and refurbishes anti-quated wharf and berthing areas.

It demolishes two old buildings, along with shipways 1 and 2.

This area would then be used to install modern ship support systems, electric distribution systems, transformers, communications upgrades, steam and water distribution systems, sanitary sewer facilities, compressed air distribution systems, salt water fire protection facilities, railroads, and crane rails.

In short, these are the utilities and equipment necessary to run a modern industrial facility.

And that is a quality of life issue for civilian workers. And you know what? Sailors work there too.

So much for when the White House said "the project would not improve quality of life for military service members and their families."

The White House also said that, "architectural and engineering design of this project has not started."

Again, not true. Anyone who bothered to check would have known the project had

reached 35 percent design back in April of 1996.

Since there are no new buildings, the design issues are not all that complicated.

In fact, the design issues focused primarily on plans for demolition and asbestos removal.

The last time I checked, that was a very serious quality of life issue for sailors and civilian employees.

But I don't think anybody from OMB ever bothered to check.

Frankly, I think OMB wanted to shoehorn all 38 projects into their arbitrary criteria, come hell or high water, my mind's made up, don't confuse me with the facts.

I would like to know who misled the President about this, though.

Still, I have to confess, on one thing they were right: This project was not in the fiscal year 1998 budget.

It is in the Navy's 5-year plan for 2001. But if the project will be funded in a few years anyway, what's the big deal?

The big deal is money.

The longer we delay the project, the longer this part of the yard will be unable to play an effective part in the yard's ship repair mission.

The longer we delay, the longer the yard must wait to consolidate functions in the highly classified controlled industrial area.

The longer the yard maintains obsolete facilities, the greater their O&M and overhead costs.

The Navy's economic analysis shows return on investment for this project takes place in 2 years.

Let me say it again: This project pays for itself in 2 years.

Once you do this project, it saves approximately \$10 million per year in the first 2 years.

Once you sort through all the numbers, over the standard 25-year cycle, this project saves over \$169 million. I repeat: \$169 million.

My question to the White House is: Why delay it 4 years?

I have never heard of anything more penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The sooner we do it, the sooner we can put the money we save to a far better use; the sooner we can give sailors and civilian employees a safer, more productive working environment.

And the sooner we can refocus attention on the partnership that Congress and the President should have when it comes to protecting our national security.

I ask the House to override this veto.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I think nothing is more important today than working to support the morale of our men and women in uniform. The President vetoed a renovation project at Malmstrom Air Force Base for a dining hall; Mr. Speaker, a dining hall that, without repairs, will not meet the local civilian health standards.

The President's veto said that the health and safety of these men and women does not matter. Today we can say that it does matter and that we care, and we can do that by supporting this resolution.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE.]

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, support the line-item veto, but I think what is instructive about all this is, when the White House uses it inappropriately, as it has in this case by its own admission, that it is up to us to appropriately use our powers to correct the deficiencies in their process. That is what we are doing here today. It will restore an important project, one that is very valid and legitimate at Camp Rapid in South Dakota.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BUYER.]

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for bringing up this bill. These are great bipartisan projects.

In particular, I want to thank the chairman. The gentleman was just down in Mayport Naval Air Station in Florida with me, and we actually went and saw one of the items that the President line item vetoed.

I wanted to share with Members, we have two Aegis cruisers down there. They had to shut them off, shut off the electronics, and they took tugboats and shoved these multimillion-dollar ships into the mud itself.

These are the types of projects the President line item vetoed, but he said if it is for social spending in the military, that is OK.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, many years ago, before the disaster struck a couple of years ago, I visited from California to Montana and States all over this Nation. I have been into residences where these people are living on the bases, our men and women. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I went to Fort Bragg, NC, and saw the conditions that the people were living in there.

We have young men and women that are called upon to operate the most sophisticated weapons on the face of the Earth, and some of them are living in World War II facilities.

Now, it is not every time that you put something in military construction that relates directly to quality of life, but if you have got a training center that was vetoed in this bill that is critical to training our troops that is in dangerous condition, just the facility, then that is something that adds to retention and quality of life for our men and women in the service.

This is not the place to debate the line item veto, but I stood in the well here and predicted that this sort of thing was going to happen, and it is going to get worse. It makes no difference whether it is a Republican President or Democrat President; when you start having the line item veto show up in political areas and being used as a political weapon, this is a disaster for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member to send a message early on, to send a message and vote unanimously in support of this bill.

I want to congratulate and thank all the Members and the staff people. I would strongly urge everyone to vote in support of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank all of those who have participated, not only in this debate, but in helping to make this a successful bill and successful effort.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we gave the President the line-item veto to help him help us trim the budget and cut down the cost of Government and eliminate wasteful and unnecessary programs. That was a good idea.

We did not expect that he would come back on one of the first bills in the appropriations cycle and use sloppy and inadequate staff work and cut meaningful, worthwhile projects. But that is exactly what he did.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for their foresight and vision in making sure that we enforce this system.

The President has a significant new power. He should use it wisely. He used it unwisely in this instance. Witness the Utah project, which was a good system to provide for the people that were training for the Olympics, or all the other projects that have been mentioned here today. These were worthwhile projects to improve the quality of life for military personnel. They should not have been struck. They should not have been used as an example by the President to flex his power, which was given to him for worthy purposes and a good cause.

It is up to us to remedy that mistake. He made the mistake. He tried to cover up on it by saying, oh, he would cure the mistake with a future budget request. That is not good enough.

□ 1500

The way he pays for the mistake is for us to disapprove these cancellations. We should do it today.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, today the house votes to sustain or override the President's line-item veto of vital projects contained in the fiscal year 1998 military construction appropriations bill. I want to share with my colleagues, and submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial appearing in one of the leading newspapers in my district, the Clayton News/Daily. I agree with Publisher Neely

Young and Editor Tom Kerlin that giving the line-item veto to the President of the United States is an excellent method to control wasteful Federal spending and programs and was proper.

I supported and voted for the bill that gave this power to the President. However, Mr. Speaker, I disagree when the President uses that power to deny funding to military construction projects that Congress has deemed vital to our national defense. I refer specifically to the President's decision to cut funds for a combat rescue operations facility located at Moody Air Force Base near Valdosta, GA.

The President said he vetoed funds for this facility because the personnel comprising these rescue units had not yet relocated to Moody Air Force Base. More thorough research would have shown the President these units have been in operation at Moody AFB since April of this year and are using rented trailers while awaiting construction funds. Our military personnel deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I still support the President having line-item veto authority to eliminate wasteful Federal spending. Providing permanent operations facilities for our military personnel is not a waste of Federal tax dollars, and I will vote to override the President's veto of this bill.

[From the Clayton News-Daily]

OPINION—BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION

Since the idea was first seriously broached, we have said the line-item veto was the perfect tool for controlling pork barrel spending by the federal government. We still believe that is true.

However, a move Monday by President Clinton in striking out the appropriations for a combat rescue operations facility for Moody Air Force Base in south Georgia is a bad example of the new power in the hands of the Executive Branch of our federal government.

In using his veto, Clinton said he did so because the money for military construction is not needed since the two units slated to use the facility have not yet been moved from Patrick Air Force Base in Florida.

That comes as news to the Sen. Max Cleland, who asked that the spending bill be attached to the 1998 military construction spending bill. It's also a revelation to the base commander at Moody AFB. Cleland said the two units, the 41st and 71st rescue squadrons, have been at Moody since April. Officials at the installation near Valdosta confirmed that the move has been completed and the units are operating out of rented trailers.

The Pentagon announced plans in early 1996 to relocate the two rescue squadrons to Moody. The relocation has brought 680 military personnel to the base, although many of them are deployed with U.S. troops to various trouble spots like Bosnia.

"I am very disappointed by this veto," said Cleland. "There is no rhyme or reason to it. Of all the projects that were included in the bill, this one made the most sense. It was my top priority for Georgia."

Sen. Paul Coverdell, R-Ga., called the veto "an arbitrary, uninformed exercise of executive power" and vowed to work with other Georgia lawmakers to overturn it.

Rep. Sanford Bishop of Albany, whose district includes the base, said the facility is essential "to maintain high readiness for this important rescue unit."

Cleland says he "support(s) the line-item veto as a way to cut out pork and reduce the deficit," but added "this facility is not pork. It is a critical project. If facilities to accom-

modate a pararescue facility are not essential, I do not know what is."

We agree with Cleland and Coverdell on this one. We wonder if Clinton got bad information, misinterpreted the information, or if he just didn't do his homework.

Either way he has managed to attain bipartisan opposition over the issue—something he can ill afford to do.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2631, a bill disapproving the cancellations of 38 military construction projects. I want to thank both distinguished Chairman HEFLEY and Chairman PACKARD for their hard work in producing two solid bills.

I voted for the line-item veto and have no problem seeing the President use it. However, it must be used properly and wisely. These 38 vetoed projects were not the famous \$600 hammers and \$1200 toilet seats the Pentagon has purchased in the past. That is what the line item was developed for.

At Arnold Engineering Development Center [AEDC] in Tullahoma, TN, a new \$9.9 million air dryer facility for the propulsion wind tunnel was eliminated by President Clinton. The wind tunnel performs advanced testing which requires dry air for simulating flight conditions. It is a critical element for ensuring accurate test results.

This cancellation will affect advanced aerospace testing for the F-22, the joint strike fighter, missiles and other state of the art flight designs. All of which require dry air for high-altitude testing. The air dryer is vital to the performance and safety for both aircraft and personnel. Any further delays in advanced wind tunnel testing for aerospace programs will certainly demand cost overruns.

The existing facility was built in 1959 and does not have the capacity to provide continuous dry air flow needed to complete aerospace testing. A major failure of the current dryer would result in an estimated 26-weeks of lost test time. Furthermore, for every 20 hours of wind tunnel testing, it must shut down for 12 hours. Delaying construction will lead to additional costs of \$1.2 million per year.

This project meets the President's so called criteria, although it is a bit vague. The new air dryer is in the President's 5-year defense budget. Architectural and engineering designs for the project were underway and construction could begin in fiscal year 1998.

The White House, the Pentagon, the Air Force, and the Office of Management Budget [OMB], have all stated on the record that crucial project data was in fact outdated and led to misinformation. The end result was that legitimate and essential military construction projects were terminated based on bad data and an inconsistent, if not, arbitrary selection process without a clear set of criteria.

AEDC relies some of the most sophisticated technologies in the world to test aerospace systems before flight. They are using antiquated 1950's technology and infrastructure to test 1990's advanced aerospace programs worth billions of dollars.

The bottom line is that this project is critical. It is critical in maintaining a portion of our military superiority. It is important, relevant and a validated military requirement for a sound infrastructure. I think that after you look at this project, you too will agree it is not what the line item veto was designed for.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 2631, I want to thank Chairman PACKARD and Mr. SKEEN for their work in getting this measure to the floor today. Many of the projects being restored will improve the quality of life for our servicemen and women. I am particularly grateful that it will restore funding for a project of vital importance to my constituents in Salk Lake City, the Olympic Village. The \$12 million in construction funds for Fort Douglas will allow the military reserves to relocate in time for the University of Utah to acquire the land and complete construction of the Olympic Village for the 2002 Winter Games. Salt Lake City may be the host city for the 2002 Winter Olympic's—but these are America games.

This bill is the first step toward overturning the President's veto and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, today this Congress has a unique opportunity. A chance to right a wrong, a chance to stand up for America, a chance to show you care to the men and women of our military and the communities which support them. A few short weeks ago, President Clinton vetoed essential military construction projects without properly consulting our military, without consideration of the impact of these vetoes on the lives and well being of our military, without consideration of the long term security interests of America. This has been going on for far too long and today we finally have an opportunity to say enough to this White House.

I have the honor and privilege of representing some of the most patriotic communities in America. Two of these communities, Del Rio and El Paso, are home of two of our finest military installations, Laughlin Air Force Base and Fort Bliss. I can say without exaggeration that Laughlin is the finest little base in the Air Force and Fort Bliss' vastness is an unmatched national security asset. Therefore I, along with each and every citizen of Del Rio and El Paso, was shocked when the President chose to veto essential projects in these communities. Today's legislation provides us with an opportunity to stand up for our military, to improve our military quality of life, to show we value our military efforts.

I want to personally tell the people of Del Rio and El Paso that this Congress will not abandon you, this Congress will not abandon our military. Today we will demonstrate our complete and total rejection of the President's dangerous and irresponsible cuts. Today we can stand united with the people of Del Rio and El Paso and reject the President's assault on our military and these communities. My colleagues, I urge you, join me in standing united with the good people of Del Rio and El Paso and turn back this President's attack on our military. Vote "yes" on H.R. 2631.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the President's use of the line-item veto on the military construction appropriations bill.

Now, I support the concept of the line-item veto. It's a tool Presidents should have as long as deficit spending continues. But my support doesn't mean that I must agree with its use in every instance.

On these specific vetoes, the administration has admitted that projects were mistakenly vetoed. One such mistake was in my district.

The President vetoed a qualified training range at Fort Knox. This range is an insightful,

cost-effective efficient answer for arms training. It saves valuable training dollars and hours by creating one range that will meet training standards for 11 different weapons.

This project saves money, time, and reduces risk to soldiers. In fact, it fulfills Secretary West's stated goal of "pursuing innovative ideas to increase efficiency."

However, the President did not consider this goal when using his line-item veto authority. Instead, he considered factors that don't hold up under close scrutiny.

According to the President, he vetoed those projects that were not included in his original budget request, those for which design work had not been completed, and those that, in his view, would provide no substantial contribution to improving the lives of soldiers.

His first reason is far-fetched because this range was included in his 5 year military construction plan. Getting beyond this fact, his original argument still doesn't stand up. Congress added many more projects than the 38 vetoed. Why didn't the President veto all of them? After all, none of them were included in his budget request.

His second reason is simply wrong. Construction is scheduled to begin next summer if the funding is approved. Furthermore, design work on this project is well underway.

Finally, to suggest this would have made no substantial contribution to the lives of soldiers is misinformed. The Army agrees that this project is needed to correct shortfalls in mandatory training. To even suggest this would not have contributed to the lives of soldiers reveals the sharp philosophical differences between the President and myself on this issue—the importance of investing in those Americans upon which our national defense rests.

Let's not put the lives of our soldiers at risk because of mistakes. The process allows us to override this veto. I urge my colleagues to do just that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. EWING]. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2631.

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

Mr. PACKARD. 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.

Without objection, the minimum time for electronic voting on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2534, postponed earlier today, will be 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 64, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 617]

YEAS—352

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt

Allen
Archer
Armey

Bachus
Baesler
Baker

Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella

Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoolley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)

Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryun
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)

Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner

Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp

Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

[Roll No. 618]

YEAS—291

Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske

Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourrette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Nethercutt
Ney

Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Ryun
Salmon
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeean
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White

Whitfield
Wicker

Wise
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—125

Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Boswell
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Carson
Chabot
Conyers
Davis (FL)
DeGette
Deutsch
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Engel
Ensign
Ewing
Filner
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske

Greenwood
Harman
Johnson (WI)
Kind (WI)
LaHood
Leach
Luther
Markey
McCarthy (MO)
McKinney
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Minge
Nussle
Owens
Petri
Poshard
Ramstad
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Towns
Upton
Vento
Waters
Waxman
Wexler

NAYS—64

NOT VOTING—18

Ballenger
Blumenauer
Cubin
Foglietta
Gillmor
Gonzalez

Kennedy (MA)
Klug
McDermott
McIntosh
Myrick
Neumann

Quinn
Riley
Schiff
Taylor (NC)
Walsh
Yates

□ 1525

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Messrs. ROTHMAN, EWING, DICKEY, MARKEY, STUPAK, WAXMAN, and RUSH Rush changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. BRADY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2534, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 291, nays 125, not voting 18, as follows:

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berman
Blagojevich
Boehrlert
Bonior
Borski
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Carson
Clay
Conyers
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gutierrez
Harman

Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klecicka
Kucinich
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey

NOT VOTING—18

Ballenger
Blumenauer
Cubin
Foglietta
Gillmor
Gonzalez

Kennedy (MA)
Klug
McDermott
McIntosh
Myrick
Neumann

□ 1540

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. DAVIS of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GREEN and Mr. LUTHER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1150), to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], is