

Gordon	Martinez	Roukema
Green	Mascara	Roybal-Allard
Gutierrez	Matsui	Rush
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Hamilton	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez
Harman	McDermott	Sanders
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Sandlin
Hefner	McHale	Sawyer
Hilliard	McIntyre	Schumer
Hinchey	McKinney	Scott
Hinojosa	McNulty	Serrano
Holden	Meehan	Sherman
Hooley	Meek	Sisisky
Hoyer	Menendez	Skaggs
Jackson (IL)	Millender-	Skelton
Jackson-Lee	McDonald	Slaughter
(TX)	Minge	Smith, Adam
Jefferson	Mink	Snyder
John	Moakley	Spratt
Johnson (WI)	Mollohan	Stabenow
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (VA)	Stenholm
Kanjorski	Murtha	Stokes
Kaptur	Nadler	Strickland
Kennedy (MA)	Neal	Stupak
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Tanner
Kennelly	Olver	Tauscher
Kildee	Ortiz	Thompson
Kilpatrick	Owens	Thurman
Kind (WI)	Pallone	Tierney
Klecza	Pascrell	Towns
Klink	Pastor	Turner
Kucinich	Payne	Velazquez
LaFalce	Pelosi	Vento
Lampson	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Lantos	Pickett	Waters
Levin	Poshard	Watt (NC)
Lewis (GA)	Price (NC)	Waxman
Lofgren	Rahall	Wexler
Lowey	Rangel	Weygand
Luther	Reyes	Wise
Maloney (CT)	Rivers	Woolsey
Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez	Wynn
Manton	Roemer	
Markey	Rothman	

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman	Herger	Pomeroy
Ballenger	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Barrett (NE)	Lipinski	Stark
Bonilla	McIntosh	Tauzin
Clayton	Miller (CA)	Taylor (NC)
DeGette	Nethercutt	Torres
Doolittle	Oberstar	Yates
Goss	Pombo	Young (AK)

□ 1140

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ballenger for, with Ms. DeGette against.

Mr. McIntosh for, Mr. Stark against.

Ms. MCKINNEY changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 220, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ALTERING ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 169, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1119 in the Committee of the Whole, and following consideration of the Luther

amendment referred to in part 1 of House Resolution 169, the following amendments be considered in the following order:

Amendments No. 22 and 41, printed in part 2 of House Report 105-137;

The amendment printed in section 8(e) contained in House Resolution 169; and

Amendment 15, printed in part 2 of House Report 105-137, as modified by section 8(b) of House Resolution 169.

And, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this be considered sufficient notice for the purposes of section 5 of House Resolution 169.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I would simply like to ask the question: Have all of the persons who the distinguished Chair has laid out as authors of amendments that we will address during the remaining period of this session today been notified as to the agreement?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, we have made every attempt to notify them and we believe they have been. I have not checked every one to make sure, but we, as we talk, will be contacting the others.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and, with those admonishments, trust the word of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the notice shall be considered sufficient.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 169 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1119.

□ 1144

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. YOUNG of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 19, 1997, amendment No. 5, printed in part 1 of House Report 105-137, offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6, printed in part 1 of House Report 105-137.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LUTHER

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. LUTHER:

At the end of title I (page 23, before line 7), insert the following new section:

SEC. 123. TERMINATION OF NEW PRODUCTION OF TRIDENT II (D-5) MISSILES.

(a) PRODUCTION TERMINATION.—Funds appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal years after fiscal year 1997 may not be obligated or expended to commence production of additional Trident II (D-5) missiles.

(b) AUTHORIZED SCOPE OF TRIDENT II (D-5) Program.—Amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense may be expended for the Trident II (D-5) missile program only for the completion of production of those Trident II (D-5) missiles which were commenced with funds appropriated for a fiscal year before fiscal year 1998.

(c) FUNDING REDUCTION.—The amount provided in section 102 for weapons procurement for the Navy is hereby reduced by \$342,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] and a Member opposed, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

□ 1145

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I am pleased today to join with my fellow Minnesotan [Mr. RAMSTAD] in offering this bipartisan amendment to the fiscal year 1998 defense authorization bill to terminate further production of the Trident D-5 submarine launched ballistic missile.

The Trident D-5 is a ballistic missile with a range of more than 4,000 nautical miles. Each is capable of carrying up to 8 independently targetable nuclear warheads at speeds in excess of 13,000 miles per hour. The U.S. Navy currently operates a force of 17 Ohio-class fleet ballistic missile submarines with an eighteenth boat scheduled to join the force later this summer. Eight of these submarines, homeported at Bangor, WA, carry the older C-4 missile system. The other 9 Ohio-class subs and the new sub being deployed this year are homeported at Kings Bay, GA, and carry the new Trident D-5 missile system. Each submarine carries 24 missiles.

In order to comply with the START II Treaty, the Navy is planning to retire four of the older subs carrying the C-4 missiles, but the Navy is currently planning to back-fit the other four with the new D-5 missiles. Although the Navy has already an inventory of 350 D-5 missiles, it nevertheless plans to procure an additional 84 Trident D-5's through the year 2005, unless Congress intercedes.

We believe the responsible course is for our Navy to cancel the proposed back-fit of the older C-4 subs and, over time, reduce its fleet of Ohio-class submarines to 10 vessels. With a fleet of 10

Ohio-class submarines carrying the new D-5 missiles, the Navy will no longer need the additional 84 missiles they have requested through fiscal year 2005. The current inventory of 350 missiles will be sufficient, 240 for the 10 Trident D-5 subs and 110 for testing purposes.

There are very important reasons why this amendment should be approved by the House of Representatives. The Trident D-5 missile is a cold war weapon specifically designed to destroy hardened missile silos and other military targets found in the former Soviet Union. But today the nuclear threat from the former Soviet Union is dramatically reduced.

While there is still an important role for strategic nuclear weapons in our arsenal, that role is dramatically reduced from what it was in the past, and weapon procurement should reflect that.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this amendment would save taxpayers with this act this year and with future subsequent acts more than \$5.7 billion over 10 years, including \$342 million in fiscal year 1998. This savings would then be available for personnel readiness and military training purposes or to reduce the deficit.

Members of the House, the United States has an unchallenged world lead in the area of submarine-launched ballistic missiles. Only Russia, China, France, and Great Britain have this capability. China has just one submarine with 12 ballistic missiles, and the Russian fleet is outmoded and largely rusting away in port. A fully modernized fleet of 10 Ohio-class subs carrying Trident D-5 missiles will continue our leadership in this critical area of strategic defense.

Balancing the budget requires continuing scrutiny of every dollar the Government spends. We need to maintain a strong military and an absolutely credible nuclear deterrent force, but we must maintain that defense while keeping in mind the realistic threats facing our country. A 10 Trident submarine fleet, carrying the new D-5 missile, is enough to secure our interests. And saving over \$5.7 billion by canceling the production of more D-5 missiles will make it much easier to balance the budget in the year 2002.

I ask that we think about the way we think about military spending. Times have changed, and I hope this amendment that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] and I are proposing will help move us into the future.

I urge my colleagues to join taxpayers for common sense in support of this bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for both proponents of this amendment, but I have to tell my colleagues that this amendment is not grounded in common sense, for a couple of reasons. There are a lot of things with re-

spect to arms control that we disagree with, conservatives, liberals, Democrats, Republicans, arms control proponents, and people who are very skeptical of the arms control process.

But there are certain cornerstones of our deterrent force and our overall strategy of deterrents that we all agree on. When I say, "we all agree on," I am speaking of not only of the majority in the Congress but also the President of the United States, whether he is a Democrat or Republican, and his respective military leaders in the Pentagon.

I have a lot of disagreements with President Clinton on security, but this is not one of them. The President, and I have several letters, one from his CNO and one from his director of the Commander in Chief, the U.S. Strategic Command, President Clinton does not want to see our strategic force, and the most important part of our triad, which is our submarine force, upon which we are going to rely for 50 percent of our deterrent counterstrike force under START II, he does not want to see that force reduced, and especially to reduce it unilaterally.

So let us review the bidding here. We have three legs of the triad. We have our missiles based on land. We have our bomber force. But the most survivable forces of our triad, our deterrent system that has worked for so many years, is undersea. It is difficult to target. It is difficult to preempt. And that deterrent force will become more and more important under START II if the Russians ever approve START II.

Now here is what my colleagues should reflect upon: START II has not yet been approved by the Russian Duma. Our friends who are offering this amendment are proposing to cut back on the number of ballistic missile submarines, in anticipation that at some point in the future there will be a START III and the Russians will give us reciprocity on this cut and will somehow come through with cuts of their own.

That is a very dangerous thing to do. Let us leave all the chips on the side of our negotiators so that, as we work down our strategic forces, they give a chip, we give a chip, they give a chip, we give a chip, and we still guard or act to detour not only the Russians but others who are now developing nuclear systems around the world.

And there are others developing those systems. The Chinese, for example, are not a part of the START II agreements. They are developing nuclear systems aimed at American cities. So it is a very dangerous thing to try to get a jump-start on arms negotiations and start unilaterally to pull down our strategic forces, especially the underwater part of our strategic forces.

All of our military experts, the White House leadership, the Pentagon, and the majority in Congress, agree the undersea part of our ballistic missile submarines are the most survivable part of

our triad. And to do away with the large portion of those in anticipation of some future concession on the part of our negotiating partners makes no sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in opposition to the Luther amendment and in support of the committee's position on this.

One of the problems here is that we have a missile on these older Tridents. The Pacific Tridents were built first. And the older missile, the C-4 missile, has a lifetime up to about 2004. Then, if we do not build the D-5 and replace the C-4's with the D-5's, we are going to have to go out and spend billions of dollars to fix up the C-4 missile.

In fact, I have been told that that course is more expensive than buying the newer, more capable missiles. So why would we not want to retrofit? The other problem is, if we have two missiles, then we have to have two infrastructures for the missiles, the D-5's. And if we can go to an all D-5 force, then we can have one missile, one set of repair parts, and it is actually, in terms of ownership, less expensive.

I would agree with my friend from California [Mr. HUNTER] that until we see what happens in the START talks, we would, in my judgment, be premature to go even from 18 to 14 in terms of the number of submarines that we have. And the D-5 program is in place. We should buy these missiles now while the line is open. We need to keep this open until we see whether, in fact, we are going to get an arms control agreement.

To cut it off now would be premature and we would have a situation where the submarines in the Atlantic have D-5's and none of the submarines in the Pacific would. The D-5 is a more capable missile, and we need to have that capability, in my judgment, in both oceans.

So I understand the intent here to try to save some money. We all want to save money. But there is a lot more to this, and it goes right to the security of the country. The D-5 and the Trident submarine are the most survivable part of our triad. I think until we get these arms control agreements in place we should stay with this program, support the administration, who strongly is committed to keeping the D-5 program going.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from California, Mr. HUNTER yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. It seems like we always go through this every year or so on what to do with the

D-5. I think the point has been made, and made very well, that as we finally had the cold war come to an end, the thing that did it was the triad system, or the system where we figured out how we were going to handle this problem.

We had the aircraft, and we looked at the old B-52, which is a very, very old airplane, came out with the B-1 and now the B-2. We got the land-based missiles, and now we are going to take the MX and take it out of the silos and all we will have is the Minuteman III.

But the ace in the hole, all this comes down to, is the D-5. I think most people, when they look at this, find out that if you can take a boat and hide it somewhere and just sit it somewhere, fine. But I still recall, when Les Aspin was the chairman of the committee, bringing in some admirals and generals from the old Soviet Union, as it was then constituted, and talked about how difficult it was to stay up with the modernization of the United States. And the key to this whole thing is modernization. C-4 has been a reliable missile, but it is the D-5 that now gives us the ace in the hole.

It would seem to me that now we have the opportunity to finish out all 14 boats, get them up to this very, very accurate missile, a missile with more range, a missile that can do the job that gives us that deciding edge that we finally won with the Soviet Union years ago. It would be very foolish, in my humble opinion, to do away with it. It also puts our negotiators in a very bad position when we have Congress micromanaging what they are going to do and what type of armament they would use.

I have great respect for my friend from Minnesota, but in my humble opinion, it would be a smart thing to defeat this amendment and go ahead with the production of the D-5.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD], cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Ramstad amendment to terminate further production of the Trident D-5 submarine launched ballistic missile. As we continue our efforts here to balance the budget and reduce the Federal debt, each and every Government program, including defense, must be scrutinized for potential savings. The further production of the Trident D-5 missile is one such program.

We already have over 350 Trident D-5's in service. At a cost of over \$50 million each, we simply cannot afford to continue increasing the size of this missile force, nor do we need to, as our missile capability is more than adequate. By ending production of this missile, we will save taxpayers \$5.7 bil-

lion over the next 10 years, without sacrificing our national security.

We must all strongly support the need for a strong national defense. But, at the same time, we cannot continue to fund programs that excessively spend scarce resources.

□ 1200

Mr. Chairman, let me read from this letter from Taxpayers for Common Sense:

As the United States moves to a balanced budget, it is unacceptable for taxpayers to finance an outdated missile program originally designed to counter Cold War threats. With 350 D-5 missiles already in service, the U.S. Navy is well-equipped, making further D-5 purchases unnecessary. Only a select few nations possess SLBM capabilities. The United States already leads the world in this area, with 4 other nations, Russia, China, France and Great Britain, all trailing in the distance. To the extent that the SLBM remains a viable strategic weapon in the redefined global arena, the United States possesses an adequate deterrent capability.

Let us save the taxpayer \$5.7 billion. Please vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the letter from Jill Lancelot from Taxpayers for Common Sense:

TAXPAYERS FOR COMMON SENSE,

June 19, 1997.

SUPPORT LUTHER-RAMSTAD AMENDMENT TO DOD BILL: CUT D-5 MISSILE—SAVE \$5.7 BILLION

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES LUTHER AND RAMSTAD: Taxpayers for Common Sense is pleased to support the Luther-Ramstad amendment to the FY98 Defense Authorization Bill to end further procurement of the D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) and deactivate eight Trident submarines currently equipped with an older missile system. This amendment would both eliminate future purchases of a weapon costing \$50 million per missile and cancel the backfitting of submarines with older missile systems, leading to ultimate savings of \$5.7 billion.

As the United States moves to a balanced budget, it is unacceptable for taxpayers to finance an outdated missile program originally designed to counter Cold War threats. With 350 D-5 missiles currently in service, the U.S. Navy is more than well-equipped, making further D-5 purchases unnecessary. Only a select few nations possess SLBM capabilities. The U.S. already leads the world in this area, with four other nations, Russia, China, France and Great Britain, all trailing in the distance. To the extent that the SLBM still remains a viable strategic weapon in the redefined global arena, the U.S. possesses an adequate deterrent capability.

To ensure that we achieve the goal of a balanced budget, Congress must make difficult decisions regarding each and every dollar. Your amendment represents a sensible balance between sound defense policy and sound budget policy.

Sincerely,

JILL LANCELOT,
Legislative Director.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes to respond briefly to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota cited a taxpayer group and their decision, their unilateral decision to disarm approximately one-third of America's most important leg of the strategic triad on the basis that they

think it is a good deal and it makes sense. I might remind my colleagues that of all of the hundreds of arms control experts and military experts and deterrent experts that we rely on, including our scientists and our policy-makers, whether they are liberal, conservative, Democrat, Republican, in the administration or in the Congress, none of those people have been cited as justifying or backing up this unilateral decision to jump start or prejump the negotiators by sacrificing one-third of our underwater deterrent. No experts have been cited. It just looks like it is a good deal for a taxpayers group.

I would suggest that the reason this defense budget today is \$140 billion less than the defense budget in 1985 is because we were strong, and we built lots of *Tridents* and we put them in the water. That brought the Russians to the negotiating table. The Russians were never brought to the negotiating table by us making unilateral concessions. They were brought to the negotiating table by us being strong and then doing one for one, under Ronald Reagan and George Bush and now under Bill Clinton. That means they give a chip, we give a chip. We do not unilaterally pull the rug out from under our negotiators by giving up big pieces of our triad.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, in fact I think Secretary Longuemare makes a good point in support of what the gentleman just said:

Delaying the backfit of 4 SSBNs with D-5 missiles sends the wrong message to Russia. It removes Russia's incentive to ratify START II in a timely manner and begin START III negotiations as agreed in Helsinki.

I have to agree. I think this would send the wrong message. If we are going to bring down the strategic forces, we want to bring them down on both sides.

I also would take some umbrage about the status of the Russian Navy. As the ranking Democrat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and someone who has served 19 years on defense appropriations, this is one area in the submarine area where the Russians are still making significant investments. I would not characterize their submarine capabilities as defective or weak. They have very capable submarines, particularly in the attack area.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in the past Members of Congress were oftentimes reluctant to propose decreases in defense spending. Those who had the temerity to suggest that we cut the spending that we do for the military or in areas of weaponry could pretty much expect to see a 30-second ad attacking their courage, their character, and their patriotism.

Things are changing here in Washington. This is a new Congress and it is a new era. No longer do we have programs that are immune from scrutiny. No longer do we not look at how we spend taxpayers' dollars. Every dollar spent must be justified.

I join the gentleman from Minnesota in supporting their proposal to strip the unnecessary and ultimately wasteful proposal within this Department of Defense budget to continue production of *Trident* D-5 missiles, and in doing so, to save the American taxpayer \$5.7 billion. Thomas Jefferson said many, many, many years ago:

Sound principles will not justify our taxing the industry of our fellow citizen to accumulate treasure for wars to happen we know not when and which might not ever happen but from the temptation offered by that treasure.

I think that is still true today. With this amendment, we are not hurting our capability to wage war in the future should that become necessary. Even if we choose to retire our aging vessels, we are left with 10 modern submarines equipped with 240 D-5 missiles. More appropriately we have the appropriate number left behind for testing and replacement and we will save the public \$5.7 billion.

This DOD proposal is a poor use of resources. By eliminating the backfitting of the C-4 subs, we will stop what is essentially a plan to put old wine in new bottles. The C-4 subs are too old to have a lot of service life left in them and they are likely to be eliminated as has been suggested by START II. But even if we keep the C-4's, a 1992 DOD study said that the current C-4 missiles would last until 2015. This proposal in no way will do what others have suggested, that we are stripping some of our submarines of arms. The internal documents of the Department of Defense suggest that that is just not true.

I support this cut. I hope others will as well. I think they should stand up for the principle here and feel secure in their patriotism because Calvin Coolidge once said, "Patriotism is easy to understand in America. It means looking out for yourself by looking out for your country."

This amendment is good for our country.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], and others, in opposing the amendment. I know the amendment is genuinely offered. I was an opponent of the D-5 missile at the beginning of the program because frankly I felt the original missile was adequate. The reality, however, is that the argument that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] makes about a unified system without the complexities and costs of supporting two missiles in the same

operation really has to win the day here. There was a time when I thought we could have done without the D-5 missile. But now as we have moved to a point where it is the dominant system out there and we need to make sure we complete that work here today because of the effect overall on the cost of maintenance, supply, of training, it adds a complication to a smaller Navy that frankly is bothersome and frankly is something that we cannot afford to do.

I would join my colleagues in opposing the amendment.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am especially pleased to speak on behalf of this amendment because it represents a cause that I have taken up in the past. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] for bringing it back to the floor yet again.

Mr. Chairman, the issue here is simple. We no longer need the *Trident* D-5 missile to defend our country. This missile was designed specifically to counter the threat of the Soviet Union, a threat which no longer exists. Under this amendment, Mr. Chairman, the United States will retain its current inventory of *Trident* D-5 missiles and submarines. All this amendment will do is stop further production of this costly missile, saving Americans \$342 million next year and saving over 10 years \$5.7 billion.

Mr. Chairman, we should be reducing our nuclear stockpile, not building it up. Stopping production of the *Trident* will send a clear message that the United States is truly committed to a nuclear nonproliferation policy.

Mr. Chairman, let us not fool ourselves. Production of the *Trident* missile is the equivalent of flushing \$5.7 billion down the toilet over the next 10 years when we should actually be funding programs that we truly need, such as education, job training, health care, and environmental protection.

The cold war is history, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to join me in closing this chapter of the history book by supporting the Luther-Ramstad amendment.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Luther-Ramstad amendment. We can safely reduce our fleet of *Trident* submarines to 10 and that will make us save \$344 million. I would say that nuclear weapons are becoming obsolete, but that is not important. What is important is what the experts say. This last December, 60 generals and admirals, including Gen. Lee Butler, who was the former Commander of the U.S. Strategic Air Command, called for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

General Butler's statement reads in part: "With the end of the cold war, these weapons are of sharply reduced utility, and there is much to be gained by substantially reducing their numbers." He went on to say, "We should explore the feasibility of their ultimate complete elimination."

Obviously, we should not be putting in new nuclear weapons. What do the American people say? In an April poll, 77 percent of those questioned favored the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all express my thanks to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member; and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] for their consideration. Also, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] and all of the other speakers who spoke so eloquently on behalf of this amendment.

Before we move to a vote on this issue, I would like to leave just a couple of thoughts with the Members of the House. First of all, please keep in mind that unlike the B-2 bomber, the D-5 missile is not a dual-use weapons system. There is no conventional warfare role for the D-5. Its sole utility is as a strategic nuclear weapon. If my colleagues are interested in voting to cut a weapons system that will not affect our ability to wage the conventional or regional wars that we must be prepared for, this is the system.

Second, keep in mind our experience with the Minuteman III land-based ICBM. Many of my colleagues will remember the plans in the 1980's to replace the Minuteman with the MX. We decided to scrap those plans. Today the Minuteman III serves as the backbone of our land-based leg of the triad. The C-4 missiles we are retiring are much more modern weapons than the Minuteman III's.

Under this amendment we will continue to have 18 *Trident* subs through the year 2001 and we will not be down to 10 subs until 2005. Until that date, the C-4 missile will continue to serve its important role in our strategic defense just like the Minuteman III.

The opponents of this amendment have made the same arguments here on the floor that have been made over the years, to run our defense budget up to the level that it is at today and to run the debt of this country up to the \$5.3 trillion of debt that we have today.

I urge Members of the House to reject that approach today. A vote for this amendment will save \$5.7 billion of unnecessary spending. My colleagues have made that commitment to their constituents to do away with unnecessary spending.

□ 1215

And we can use that money for other more important purposes or to help balance the budget.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The remaining time is 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] who has the right to close.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an example of snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. We have an arms control process that is walking down the line that has taken us to the point where we are waiting for the Soviet Union to ratify the second arms agreement. We have got a situation where we can get a quid pro quo; that means when we take down a weapons system, the Soviet Union, now Russia, will take down a weapons system, and I want to answer just a couple of things that the proponents of this amendment made that are just not the case, a couple of their arguments.

First, this does not save any money. According to the Navy it is \$2.3 billion to upgrade the C-4 missile. If we are not going to have the D-5, we are going to have to upgrade the C-4. That is \$2.3 billion. According to the Navy, if we add all the termination costs, we are actually going to pay, the taxpayers will pay, 60 million more dollars to maintain the old C-4 missile then to complete the project on the D-5 missile. So we do not save money for the taxpayers according to the Navy. We spend an extra \$60 million.

But second and most importantly, there have been no experts here that have said that we should unilaterally eliminate this program without getting anything from the Soviet Union. The assembled admirals and generals who were quoted here simply said we should eventually do away with nuclear weapons. Well, the best way to eventually do away with nuclear weapons is to have something to negotiate with to get the Soviets to and the Russians to walk down on their inventory.

This is giving up something unilaterally that means we will not get a concession from Russia for it, we will not get an SS-18 removed, we will not get one of their strategic boats removed, we will simply make a unilateral concession.

So we get nothing for it economically, we get nothing for it in terms of arms control; it is not an amendment of value, it is a dangerous amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment the gentleman. He has got this exactly right. This is one of those ironies. If we kill the D-5, we are going to spend more on the existing missile which is less capable. It is less capable. And then we got 2 systems, we are going to have the duplication in repair, spare parts and everything else.

So let us stay with the program. At some point in the future, as my colleagues know, we may get down to 14, but that is going to be when we have agreed to it, when there is a negotiated agreement between the 2 sides.

To do it unilaterally I think would be a very serious mistake, and I urge a no vote on the Luther Ramstad amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] for his very articulate statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and urge a no vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Under section 2(c) of the rule, the gentleman does have that right and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to both sides of this debate, and I would like to indicate to my colleagues that I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague.

Now let us have the discussion.

I would ask my colleagues:

"Would you authorize new construction on a base you're going to close?"

The point I make here is that if we know where we are headed, we know where we are going, the only issue is how do we get there most efficiently, most effectively, and, in this limited dollar environment, most economically.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we think boldly, not this incremental cautious step that ends up costing the American taxpayers billions and billions of dollars at a time when we do not need to spend them.

Now, when my colleagues on this side of the aisle in support of the amendment have indicated that it would save them \$5.67 billion, Mr. Chairman, that is only part of the savings.

My colleagues who oppose this amendment said: But we will have to upgrade C-4 missiles.

Think boldly. I am going to give my colleagues a proposal that does not require them to improve C-4 missiles.

Think boldly. I am going to give my colleagues a proposal that does not require them to retrofit.

Think boldly. I am going to give my colleagues a proposal that does not allow them to have to worry about two missiles.

We are sitting here debating about whether it is boats or missiles. It is about warheads. The boats and the missiles are only the delivery system. What we are looking at, at this point, are a large number of boats with few warheads.

Think boldly. Few boats, greater number of warheads, saving the American taxpayers not just \$5.7 billion, but two to three times more money at a time that we live in a limited dollar environment.

What is the proposal? Go now to 10 boats. The Navy could then with 10 boats meet essential requirements under START II today and the anticipated requirements under START III framework tomorrow. We can do both simultaneously.

Think boldly. Not from 16, 14, 13, 12; go to 10. My colleagues know where they are headed. Save the money.

We have been talking about a 5-year budget agreement where we have to scrutinize every dollar. Well, get out of this little cautious approach that we have and save people money. By varying the number of missiles outloaded per boat and the number of warheads uploaded per missile this can be accomplished within the current 350-missile inventory.

This approach would save us, as I said, from expensive C-5 retrofit for four to eight boats. That is not necessary, the multibillion-dollar cost to buy 84 D-5 missiles planned through the year 2005, and the operation and support costs associated with the above.

Do the math on that, Mr. Chairman; we have saved the American taxpayer \$10, \$15 billion.

But move beyond the point that they are trying to make. We all know that we are trying to go to a new world. We all know that we are moving toward fewer and fewer nuclear weapons and greater capability.

My colleague from California says this is unilateral disarmament. That is bizarre. What we are looking at, at this point, is the Navy buying a fixed amount of missiles and then varying the boats.

Now, one does not have to be too smart to recognize that a boat costs a hell of a lot of money, a lot more money than the missile. I say turn it around, think rationally, vary the number of missiles, fix the number of boats. Go quickly to 10. I know it is bold, but I want to shake my colleagues up some. We have been talking about saving American people money. This is not about unilateralism. Those are euphemisms and hot-button words, but rational intelligent, thought says that we ought to go someplace, save money.

With those thoughts I am in enthusiastic and overwhelming support to the gentleman's amendment.

One last point. If there is any problem with the gentleman's amendment, it is that he has thought further out than most people have thought. He got here faster than anybody got here. This debate is a preview of a debate that we are going to have next year and the year after next. I compliment the gentleman for his over-the-horizon forward thinking. He got there before everybody did. He put before this body what needs to be discussed, and it needs to be discussed now, and the earlier we start to think about it, the better off we will be.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to exercise the authority to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from California for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to take this time to engage with my colleague and with the other side, and I just want to go over the points that have been made earlier and the points that he spoke to.

First, according to the Navy, and if we are going to save money, we have got to put a pencil to the balance sheet and we have to try to figure out whether extending the life of the C-4 is going to be cheaper or more expensive than buying the rest of the D-5. If money, and I would submit there is a lot more to this debate than just money, but if money is the object, we have got to put a pencil to it and see if it works. According to the Navy it does not work, and we end up spending \$60 million more extending the life of the C-4 missile than completing the program on D-5. Now that is the fact.

Second, let me just say to my friend, as my colleagues know, this is a long debate that we have been in; he and I have debated arms control for 16 years now, and I can recall the early days of the 1980's when Ronald Reagan was building a stronger strategic deterrent. My friend answered "No, that is not the way to go, and you are driving the Russians away from the bargaining table," and when the Russians were lining our European allies' borders with SS-20 missiles and Ronald Reagan said we are going to put in ground-launched cruise missiles and Pershings to meet them, and there was enormous debate in Europe in the mid 1980's, there were many people on this side of the ocean, many pundits, many journalists, many Members of Congress who said, "You are driving the Russians away from the negotiating table," but by being strong and by establishing a reinforced strategic triad, and that included our land based systems, going with the B-1 bomber on our air breathing systems and putting more capability into our undersea systems we brought the Russians to the negotiating table, and one day the phone rang and all of a sudden the Russians wanted to talk, and we started down this trail of arms negotiations.

But the genius of our side in the arms negotiations and reductions has been that we have gotten a quid pro quo for everything we have given up, we have gotten something in return. The President of the United States said "Trust but verify." We do not unilaterally make concessions. That has worked, Mr. Chairman. We are now walking the Russians down on arms control.

So the gentleman's ascertainment that this is a brilliant thing for Congress to unilaterally start giving up pieces of the strategic triad in anticipation of a third arms control agreement when the

second arms control agreement has not even been ratified by the Russian Duma does not make any sense in that it is totally inconsistent with our history. And I think my friend wants to talk, and I am going to yield to him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. One very quick response to the gentleman is: The logic. Do we build up to build down. To build up we are going to spend billions of dollars and we know we are ultimately going to build down. That is the answer to the gentleman's point, that is the central part of this debate, and that is what needs to be developed. If we accept the logic of spending money going up so we negotiate to go down, the gentleman may have a point.

I do not see the point in that, I do not see the wisdom, and I certainly do not see the economics.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I will explain what I think is the wisdom there.

We are going to a smaller and smaller strategic triad. Both sides have agreed that part of the triad that remains is going to be as modern and effective and as reliable as possible.

Now our experts have determined that the most reliable part of the strategic triad is the undersea part; it is certainly the most invulnerable part, and that the D-5 missile is an important component of that part of the strategic triad. It is the most modern, the most accurate, the most effective, the most reliable.

So when we are going to build down and we are going to get down to a smaller number of units, carrying that very important American deterrent, we want to have the best.

Now the Russians, I would offer to my friend, have done exactly the same thing. They have not thrown away their modern stuff and left their old stuff. They have kept the most modern part of their own strategic triad in place.

It is our right under the arms control agreement to stay strong in that respect. I think we owe it to the American people to stay strong in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. To establish some reality to people who are listening to this debate, we already have 350 of these missiles. The debate is whether we buy 84 additional ones. I am saying that is the build up to build down.

In my proposal we can stay within the anticipated requirements of START II, of the START II negotiation, and what we anticipate in START III, we can do that within the current inventory of 350. Why buy 84 more because we know we are going to come down again?

That logic escapes me; the gentleman cannot make me understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 169, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1230

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 169, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 in part 2 of House Report 105-137.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. HEFLEY:

At the end of title XXXIV (page 504, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 3404. TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION, NAVAL OIL SHALE RESERVES NUMBERED 1 AND 3.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—Chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section: "**§7439. Certain oil shale reserves: transfer of jurisdiction and petroleum exploration, development, and production**

"(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—(1) Upon the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Energy shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior administrative jurisdiction over all public domain lands included within Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 1 and those public domain lands included within the undeveloped tract of Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 3.

"(2) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Energy shall transfer to the Secretary of the Interior administrative jurisdiction over those public domain lands included within the developed tract of Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 3, which consists of approximately 6,000 acres and 24 natural gas wells, together with pipelines and associated facilities.

"(3) Notwithstanding the transfer of jurisdiction, the Secretary of Energy shall continue to be responsible for all environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities that are required under Federal and State laws with respect to conditions existing on the lands at the time of the transfer.

"(4) Upon the transfer to the Secretary of the Interior of jurisdiction over public domain lands under this subsection, the other provisions of this chapter shall cease to apply with respect to the transferred lands.

"(b) AUTHORITY TO LEASE.—(1) Beginning on the date of the enactment of this section, or as soon thereafter as practicable, the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into leases with one or more private entities for the purpose of exploration for, and development and production of, petroleum (other than in the form of oil shale) located on or in public domain lands in Oil Shale Reserves Numbered 1 and 3 (including the developed tract of Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 3). Any such lease shall be made in accordance with the requirements of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C 181 et seq.) regarding the lease of oil

and gas lands and shall be subject to valid existing rights.

"(2) Notwithstanding the delayed transfer of the developed tract of Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 3 under subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a lease under paragraph (1) with respect to the developed tract before the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section.

"(c) MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall manage the lands transferred under subsection (a) in accordance with the Federal and Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and other laws applicable to the public lands.

"(d) TRANSFER OF EXISTING EQUIPMENT.—The lease of lands by the Secretary of the Interior under this section may include the transfer, at fair market value, of any well, gathering line, or related equipment owned by the United States on the lands transferred under subsection (a) and suitable for use in the exploration, development, or production of petroleum on the lands.

"(e) COST MINIMIZATION.—The cost of any environmental assessment required pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) in connection with a proposed lease under this section shall be paid out of unobligated amounts available for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Land Management.

"(f) DISTRIBUTION OF RECEIPTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all moneys received from a lease under this section (including sales, bonuses, royalties (including interest charges collected under the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)), and rentals) shall be paid and distributed under section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) in the same manner as moneys derived from other oil and gas leases involving public domain lands other than naval petroleum reserves."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The tale of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"7439. Certain oil shale reserves: transfer of jurisdiction and petroleum exploration, development, and production."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have an amendment that would transfer the administrative jurisdiction over oil shale reserves 1 and 3 from the Department of Energy to the Bureau of Land Management at the Department of the Interior. It would direct the leasing of oil and gas, natural gas rights on two reserves and the outright sale of some existing equipment.

The bill is based upon discussions between the two departments. It embodies four points of agreement between the two agencies. It reflects recommendations of an Energy Department report entitled "Report and Recommendations on Management and Disposition of Naval Petroleum Oil Shale Reserves." This report was a request from the Subcommittee on Mili-

tary Readiness of the Committee on National Security last year.

The Department of Energy would be responsible for 50 acres of cleanup at the NOSR site 3. The amendment specifies that any environmental assessment costs for the leasing program will be funded out of unobligated administrative funds at the Bureau of Land Management. The amendment will allow a continuing revenue stream to the United States Transfer and leasing would, at worst, result in no loss to the Treasury and has the potential to rake in as much as \$126 million in Federal revenues over the next 10 years. Even the CBO's conservative estimates give this amendment a positive score of \$10 million.

The State of Colorado has done a study which appears to show that the Federal share of royalty revenues through the first 5 years of the leasing program could total up to \$53.1 million. Later revenues could run that total to \$126.6 million.

Leasing under my amendment would be conducted under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. Precedent has been set for a 50-50 royalty split under that act. This split was developed through negotiations on leasing of oil on National Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska in the 1970's, and it took 40 years to develop this agreement. The split is also endorsed by the Energy Department.

The Committee on Resources apparently has no problem with inclusion in the defense authorization, as long as the 50-50 split is maintained.

In conclusion, this is an issue that has been around for at least 8 years that I have been involved in it. Senator CAMPBELL first introduced it over here, and I got a bill in the past two Congresses. Two years ago I asked that it be included in the defense mark. It was believed more study was needed and ordered the Energy Department to study the issue. This spring the Energy Department delivered this report which I showed earlier, and its findings mirrored this amendment. I am trying to do in this amendment what the Energy Department in their study and the Department of the Interior have suggested that we do.

Despite these findings, this proposal has not been seriously considered, and despite the fact its central premise is endorsed by the very report the subcommittee commissioned. The amendment offers us the opportunity to benefit the State, private industry, and the Federal Treasury, and that is a rare opportunity. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask for the support of the body.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment and wish that I had more than 5 minutes in order to explain the background and the reason why.

I am not in disagreement with the gentleman's amendment insofar as it

calls for the leasing of the naval oil shale petroleum reserves. I agree with him that this is the better disposition of these properties in terms of the benefit to the taxpayers of the United States, whose resource or asset this is.

These properties were set aside by the Federal Government after the turn of the century when the Navy turned from coal-fired to oil-fired vessels. They are no longer recorded as necessary to national security purposes, and the property, therefore, can appropriately be disposed of. But it ought to be disposed of in a way that the profit or the income derived therefrom redound to the benefit of all of the people and all of the States of the United States.

The problem that I have with the gentleman's amendment is that, by transferring the properties from the Department of Energy to the Department of the Interior and directing their leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act, it essentially has the practical effect of saying that 50 percent of all of the revenues generated from the leasing will redound to the State of Colorado, and only 50 percent, instead of 100 percent, will redound to the benefit of all of the other States of the Union.

We are dealing here with property which has always been Federal property. It was Federal when Utah, Colorado, and California entered the Union; it has been Federal through all of the years since. Now that it is not necessary for national security purposes and should be disposed of, it should be disposed of in a way that redounds best to the interest of all of the States of the Union and its taxpayers.

While I have no disagreement with any equitable claims that Colorado may mount as to having added value that generates additional revenue and there being recompense for it, nor would I have any objection, since we are dealing with a resource that we are using only for purposes of generating revenue, to Colorado receiving income in lieu of taxes as they would on private property that was being leased. But I do not see the reason, nor the equity, of the taxpayers of America, whose asset this is, receiving only 50 percent of the benefit.

There is a further problem with the amendment in that it deals only with the Naval Oil Shale Petroleum Reserves 1 and 3 in Colorado. It does not deal with the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 2 in California, nor with the naval petroleum reserves in Utah, nor Naval Oil Shale Reserve No. 2 in, I believe, Wyoming. This is a defect in the bill in the context of how to work out a total solution of the proper and most sound disposition of these resources.

It is for those reasons that I would ask for a no vote on the gentleman's amendment, and hope that we will be able to work with the Senate, which has a different provision in their bill, in order to see that an equitable and comprehensive disposition is made of these properties.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] and I agree on most aspects of this. He is just scared to death that Colorado might get something that it does not deserve.

I make no argument when the State of Virginia gets help cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay, which we did not pollute, but I think it is important that we clean it up. But he seems to be afraid that we are going to get something in the West that we should not have.

This amendment mirrors the recommendations of a report delivered to the Subcommittee on Military Readiness in March. That report recommended the transfer and leasing of all three Navy oil shale reserves, the two involved in this amendment and one in Utah. The Energy Department endorsed transfer and leasing because it says in the report BLM management would yield a wide variety of economic and noneconomic benefits to the Nation. The amendment also retains the split, as we have already talked about.

Let me explain why this is a good thing. First, it is the law. The Mineral Leasing Act provides an exemption for a revenue split on strategic properties, but the only time the subject has arisen under the Department of Energy involved NPR No. 4 in Alaska in the 1970's. After lawsuits and much negotiations, the two sides settled on the 50-50 split.

Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time I have remaining to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 10 seconds.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Chairman, what the good gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] has said is absolutely correct. This is the recommendation of the Department of Energy and I urge my colleagues to support it. It makes budgetary sense, and again, it follows the recommendations of the Department of Energy.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

No. 1, let me say that these properties were exempted at all times up to the present time from the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act. They have always been Federal properties, Federal assets, and I think the disposition of them should redound to the benefit of all of the people of the United States. This is not a Virginia issue versus Colorado; this is 49 States versus Colorado in terms of a fair disposition of the properties.

Let me conclude by saying that, while, yes, the Department of Energy recommends for these properties what the gentleman from Colorado is suggesting, it is with some significance that the Secretary of Energy, the new Secretary of Energy is the former

mayor of the city of Denver, which the last time I checked, was in Colorado.

What I am suggesting is a more equitable disposition that is in keeping with the findings of the General Accounting Office, and I would again ask for a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment. There are many reasons, but three are particularly important:

First, because it cuts red tape. DOE isn't a land-management agency, and the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management (BLM) already does most of the management of these lands, under an agreement with DOE. Our amendment would simply make BLM's role permanent, and end duplication.

Second, because it's good for multiple-use management: Oil shale isn't a realistic energy source now, but some of these lands also have potential for natural gas. Under our amendment, BLM would make these areas available for leasing, under the same laws that govern leasing of other lands BLM manages. At the same time, other uses (like grazing, hunting, and fishing) would continue under experienced BLM management.

And, third, because it's good for the environment: Part of these lands have high environmental values, including many rare plants and animals. Under our amendment, BLM, through its planning process, will provide for their continued protection and will consider whether some of these lands should be set aside as wilderness or given other special protected designation.

Mr. Chairman, transferring these lands to BLM makes sense, and has been recommended by the administration. I urge the House to follow that recommendation and to approve this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 169, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 169, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 in part 2 of House Report 105-137.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

At the end of title XII (page 379, after line 19), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1205. PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATIONS CONCERNING DETARGETING OF RUSSIAN INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES.

(a) REQUIRED CERTIFICATIONS.—Not later than January 1, 1998, the President shall submit to Congress a report containing a certification by the President of each of the following:

(1) Whether it is possible for the United States to verify by technical means that a Russian ICBM is or is not targeted at a site in the United States.

(2) The length of time it would take for a Russian ICBM formerly, but no longer, targeted at a site in the United States to be re-targeted at a site in the United States.

(3) Whether a Russian ICBM that was formerly, but is no longer, targeted at a site in the United States would be automatically re-targeted at a site in the United States in the event of an accidental launch of such missile.

(b) RUSSIAN ICBMS DEFINED.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "Russian ICBM" means an intercontinental ballistic missile of the Russian Federation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment, which may seem unimportant to some, but which is perhaps in my opinion one of the most important statements that this body will make in this bill this year.

Mr. Chairman, as all of us know, the funding level for what our military needs are is largely determined by the threat that is perceived by the American people and by Members of Congress. So if the American people perceive that there is no threat, then in fact they want us to cut defense spending. If they in fact think there is an emerging threat, then they respond and say increase defense spending.

Now, our colleagues are going around saying well, the American people are satisfied; we are spending too much on defense.

Mr. Chairman, my question is, why would they think that? Well, Mr. Chairman, my amendment gets right to the heart of why they think that, because this President, over the last 5 years, has used the bully pulpit to drive home a message that I seriously question, and let me get at the heart of my amendment.

On 130 occasions, actually it is 130 and counting, this President has made the statement; so it is not just once, three times in this pulpit, at universities across the country, in 36 of our States, to women's groups, to environmental groups, on college campuses, he has said, and I quote: There are no longer Russian missiles pointed at America's children.

Now, he has made this statement not one time, 130 times; and his chief advisers in the security operation and the

Vice President have made that contention 22 more times in public speeches. So the President is clearly trying to get the point across to America, do not worry; as the Commander in Chief, I certify to you that there are no Russian missiles pointed at America's children.

Mr. Chairman, in testimony before my subcommittee, Bruce Blair, a former targeting officer, said that one can retarget a Russian missile in 10 seconds. Ed Bradley on CBS News, "60 Minutes" interviewed General Sergeev who in fact headed up strategic command and space for Russia and who now is the defense minister.

□ 1245

He has said there is no way to verify whether or not they are targeting their missiles at our children, just like they cannot verify ours. But yet the President continues to make this statement, that there are no missiles pointed at our children, so all of our constituents back home in our districts think, well, if the Commander in Chief said they are no longer pointing their missiles at us, that must be true.

My amendment is very simple, Mr. Chairman. It requires the President to certify to the Congress that in fact there are no missiles pointed at America; that in fact we have a way of verifying that, and also what the time would be to retarget a missile, even if we did know.

Why is this so important? Because when the top leaders of this country on 152 occasions on every major media network in every major media outlet tell the stories in our cities and towns that we no longer have a threat, they respond. They criticize us when we say that we need to deal with that threat.

This amendment is very simple. It says, Mr. President, certify what you are saying. You said from this pulpit on three occasions that you are confident there are no missiles pointed at America's kids. This amendment says, certify that, put that in writing, and verify that for this Congress. If you cannot do that, Mr. President, you had better stop misinforming the American people.

Nothing is more fundamental to this debate, because that speech, given 130 times by the President, 22 times by the Vice President, by the heads of security for this administration, has misled the American people. The President has a chance to rectify it. All he has to do is give us an official certification that in fact he can certify that there are no Russian missiles pointed at our children.

General Sergeyev from Russia says you cannot do that. Bruce Blair says you cannot do that. General Shalikashvili says you cannot do that. Secretary Perry told us you cannot do that. But yet the President has said it 130 times.

What we are saying in effect, Mr. Chairman, is, put up or shut up. If you cannot verify the statement that you

are making to the American people about one of the most severe threats facing this country, then do not mislead the American people, because from the bully pulpit that drives the debate in this country, to have the American people believe that they no longer have to worry, that drives the debate on missile defense, it drives the debate on the threat, and it drives the debate on the systems that we want to fund.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this very simple amendment.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], I appreciate the gentleman's effort to offer this amendment. I share the gentleman's concern about the issue of targeting. I rise in opposition not to the substance of what my colleague is trying to do, but rather, on technical grounds.

My staff and I have attempted to work with the gentleman's staff in trying to achieve some accommodation on this matter on technical grounds. We would believe that a report, rather than certification, is much more in the realm of reality. Let me tell the gentleman what I am thinking and then he can respond.

I heard the gentleman's speech, but at some point this gets drafted into legislative language. Legislative language is very important. The gentleman mentioned, required certification. The President must certify. Now, what is the President's first certification, whether it is possible for the United States to verify by technical means that a Russian ICBM is or is not targeted at a site in the United States?

We can try to verify that it is possible or that it is not possible, but trying to verify whether it is possible, I would suggest that that is language and a technical change, that it is impossible to verify whether. You either certify that something is or it is not, but whether it is, I think is inappropriate language. I think that is technically flawed.

Second, how do we verify the length of time it would take for an ICBM, a Russian ICBM, formerly but no longer targeted at a site in the United States, to be retargeted at a site in the United States? How in the real world do you really certify that?

What I am saying is, I agree with the gentleman with respect to the substance of what he is trying to do. I have a technical concern that he raises a hurdle beyond which no one, that no one can jump.

In the real world, I respect the gentleman's sense of fairness and fair play. We do not want to set a hurdle that no one can cross and then say, gee, you cannot jump the hurdle. There is something inappropriate about that. We want to establish a hurdle that makes sense with the Government. We are trying to do something reasonable. I would think if we could move away from certification to report, that makes sense.

I would like to work with the gentleman, if this amendment goes forward, in the context of the conference with the other body to try to resolve these matters.

There is one other thing that I would like to see in the legislation. Additional efforts to achieve verifiability, efforts to achieve confidence in these matters, if we could put that in, it seems to me that would make sense. I am just raising a technical question, not a substantive issue.

I think we are talking about trying to verify some things we cannot verify. We ought to, in the legislative process, try to achieve things that are achievable, rather than to assert matters that we want to try to achieve that in the real world we know we cannot. I know the gentleman is not trying to play games in that regard. That is why I am prepared to give and take on that. How does he think about those things and what is his response?

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

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman and my friend for raising these issues. I pledge to work with him through the conference process.

I would not raise this issue if the President had made this statement only one or two times, and I have the actual citation for every time he has made the statement. Mr. Chairman, the President has raised this issue specifically 130 times. The Vice President and his staff have raised it 22 times.

There is a very deliberate effort on the part of the administration to make this same statement, which the gentleman, I think, agrees with me on, we cannot verify it, but yet the President continues to make this statement. And that drives the mood and the feeling of my constituents, because they think, well, if the Commander in Chief says this, it must be true.

I understand the gentleman's concern with the wording, and I would say he is probably correct, no wording will probably satisfy this, because in the end he knows what the President is going to come back and say. We asked DOD to do a report last year on this same issue. They came back and said to us in a report, you cannot verify it.

My point is, even though DOD in a report certified that to us, the President, between last year's bill and this year, has made that statement time and time again across the country. I

have no other recourse. I would like to go to the President and say, Mr. President, please stop saying this, not just because it is not true, but you send the wrong message.

As the gentleman knows, I am not an alarmist. I have spent a lot of time working with Russia. But I would like to be frank and candid and open and honest with them. I will confront them on this issue, but I think when the President makes this statement, in the context of the number of times he has made it since, it is wrong, but I will pledge to work with the gentleman through the conference process.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's candor.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following:

ONE HUNDRED THIRTY AND COUNTING: PRESIDENT CLINTON ASSURES US NO NUCLEAR MISSILE THREAT EXISTS

President Clinton has assured the American people on at least 130 separate occasions that Russian nuclear missiles no longer threaten the United States. On dozens of those occasions—including his October 6, 1996 debate with Senator Bob Dole—he said that no nuclear missiles of any kind threaten America. The following quotes are excerpted from his speeches, interviews, and radio addresses, as downloaded from the "White House Virtual Library" on the World Wide Web and other electronic databases.

1. "I was proud to go to Russia and sign an agreement where we agreed that for the first time in decades we would no longer even point our missiles at each other."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Citizens of Atlanta, May 3, 1994.

2. "There are no nuclear missiles pointed at us from the Soviet Union [sic], but there are other countries trying to develop nuclear programs."—President Clinton, Remarks at the Small Business Person of the Year Announcement, Old Executive Office Building, May 4, 1994.

3. "And now, for the first time, our nuclear missiles are no longer targeted at Russia, nor theirs ours [sic]."—President Clinton, Remarks on CNN Telecast, "A Global Forum with President Clinton," May 4, 1994.

4. "The nuclear arsenal in Russia is no longer pointed at the United States, nor are our missiles pointed at them."—President Clinton, Remarks to the People of Warwick, Rhode Island, May 9, 1994.

5. "The United States and Russia at last no longer aim their nuclear weapons at each other."—President Clinton, Speech at the U.S. Naval Academy Graduation Ceremony, May 25, 1994.

6. "For the first time since the dawn of the atomic age, the United States and Russia no longer have nuclear missiles pointed at each other."—President Clinton, Remarks at Swearing-In Ceremony for the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, Rose Garden, May 31, 1994.

7. "We are reducing nuclear stockpiles, and America and Russia no longer aim their nuclear missiles at each other."—President Clinton, Address to the National Assembly, Paris, France, June 7, 1994.

8. "For the first time since World War II Russian and American missiles no longer target each other's people. Three of the four nuclear members of the former Soviet Union have agreed to remove all nuclear weapons from their soil."—President Clinton, Address to the 49th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, September 26, 1994.

9. "Our missiles no longer target each other's people for destruction; instead they are

being dismantled."—President Clinton, Remarks at arrival ceremony for Russian President Boris Yeltsin, South Lawn, the White House, September 27, 1994.

10. "We've got Russian missiles that are no longer pointed at the United States for the first time since World War II."—President Clinton, Radio interview with Eileen Ratner, October 7, 1994.

11. "Russian President Boris Yeltsin came to further the partnership between our two nations so well expressed by the fact that now Russian and U.S. missiles are no longer pointed at each other's people, and we are working to reduce the nuclear threat even more."—President Clinton, Address to the Nation, The Oval Office, October 10, 1994.

12. "... for the first time the missiles of Russia are no longer pointed at the American people..."—President Clinton, Speech to the Citizens of the Bridgeport Area, Stratford, Connecticut, October 15, 1994.

13. "The United States and Russian missiles are no longer targeted at each other."—President Clinton, Saturday Radio Address, October 15, 1994.

14. "Russian missiles are no longer pointed at the United States."—President Clinton, Speech to the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Albuquerque, New Mexico, October 17, 1994.

15. "I know that this country is a safer and more secure place because Russian missiles aren't pointing at us and we're making peace in Haiti, the Middle East, Northern Ireland."—President Clinton, Interview with WLIB radio, New York, October 18, 1994.

16. "We also clearly are working to make the world a safer and a more democratic and a freer place. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, Russian missiles are no longer pointed at the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Governors Leadership Conference on the Future of the Economy, New York, October 19, 1994.

17. "Is the fact that Russian missiles are not pointed at your children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age an abnormal thing? I think that's pretty good."—President Clinton, Remarks at dinner honoring Kathleen Brown, San Francisco, October 22, 1994.

18. "I wanted you to be safer. And that's why I'm so proud of the fact that these little children are the first generation of Americans since the dawn of nuclear power that do not have Russian missiles pointing at them. I'm proud of that."—President Clinton, Remarks at the Washington State Coordinated Campaign Rally, Seattle, October 23, 1994.

19. "... we've had the success in no Russian missiles are pointed at American children for the first time."—President Clinton, Interview, Cleveland Plain Dealer, October 24, 1994.

20. "For the first time since nuclear weapons were developed, no Russian missiles are pointed at the children of Ohio and the United States this year."—President Clinton, Reception honoring Congressman Thomas Sawyer, Akron, Ohio, October 24, 1994.

21. "Russian missiles aren't pointed at Americans for the first time since the beginning of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Interview, KYW radio, Philadelphia, from Pittsburgh, October 31, 1994.

22. "For the first time since nuclear weapons came about, there are no Russian missiles pointed at our people."—President Clinton, Interview, WDIV-TV, Detroit, October 31, 1994.

23. "The Russian missiles aren't pointing at us for the first time since we've had nuclear weapons."—President Clinton, Interview, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, October 31, 1994.

24. "... we've increased trade and reduced the nuclear threat for the first time since

the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointing at your children or grandchildren."—President Clinton, speech to Senior Citizens, Portuguese Social Club, Pawtucket, Rhode Island, November 2, 1994.

25. "Here's what the Contract [With America] says—now, pay attention. The contract says, vote for the Republicans, put us in charge in Washington, and here is what we will do. We'll give everybody a tax cut, but mostly people in the upper-income groups—they'll get 70 percent of it. We will increase defense; we will bring back Star Wars; and we will balance the budget. Well, how much does that cost? A trillion dollars. How are we going to pay for it? We'll tell you after the elections. (Laughter.) ... We [in the administration] have reduced the nuclear threat. For the first time since nuclear weapons were developed, there are no missiles pointed at the children of Iowa and the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks to the People of Des Moines, Iowa, November 3, 1994.

26. "And for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of Iowa. This is a great country."—President Clinton, Remarks at Reception for Democratic Candidates, Des Moines, November 3, 1994.

27. "Here's what they [the Republicans] promise ... we're going to increase defense and we're going to bring back Star Wars. And then we're going to balance the budget. (Laughter). And how much does that cost? ... I want you to think about this—we're also moving forward overseas. No Russian missiles are pointed at the children of Minnesota and the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Duluth Campaign rally, Duluth, Minnesota, November 4, 1994.

28. "I think it makes a difference that for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian nuclear missiles pointed at these children here."—President Clinton, "Rally for Victory," Oakland, California, November 5, 1994.

29. "And we're a lot closer toward having a safer, more democratic, more free world. Russian missiles aren't pointing at us ..."—President Clinton, Interview with Larry King, CNN, November 6, 1994.

30. "... there are no Russian missiles pointed at these children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age ..."—President Clinton, Speech at the Delaware Democrat Rally, Wilmington, Delaware, November 7, 1994.

31. "So I think it matters that for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at these children here."—President Clinton, Speech at "Get Out the Vote" rally, Flint, Michigan, November 7, 1994.

32. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States."—President Clinton, Speech on the 75th anniversary of the Edmund J. Walsh School of Foreign Policy, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. November 10, 1994.

33. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, not Russian missiles are pointed at Americans."—President Clinton, Radio Address to the Nation, Elmendorf AFB, Anchorage, Alaska, November 12, 1994.

34. "... getting the nuclear agreement between Russia and Ukraine which led to no Russian missiles pointed at the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks at Press Conference, Jakarta, Indonesia, November 15, 1994.

35. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointed at the children of the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks to

U.S.—Pacific Business Community Members and Leaders, November 16, 1994.

36. "... if you look at the fact that in Russia for the first time since nuclear weapons came on the face of the earth, there are no Russian missiles pointed at American children, you'd have to say we're on the move."—President Clinton, Remarks to Military Personnel and Families at Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii, November 16, 1994.

37. "This is the first Thanksgiving since the dawn of the nuclear age when parents can tuck their children into bed at night knowing that no Russian missiles are pointed at the children of the United States."—President Clinton, Radio Address from Camp David, November 26, 1994.

38. "This is the first State of the Union address ever delivered since the beginning of the Cold War when not a single Russian missile is pointed at the children of America."—President Clinton, State of the Union address, January 24, 1995.

39. "There are no Russian missiles pointed at America now for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Interview with Tom Brokaw, NBC Nightly News, January 26, 1995.

40. "As a result of an agreement President Yeltsin and I reached, for the first time in a generation Russian missiles are not pointed at our cities or our citizens. ... [Per the terms of START I] Both our countries are dismantling the weapons as fast as we can. And thanks to a far-reaching verification system, including on-site inspections which began in Russia and the United States today, each of us knows exactly what the other is doing."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom Policy Conference, Washington, D.C., March 1, 1995.

41. "And for the first time since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the children of the United States of America."—President Clinton, Address to the Faculty and Students of Hillsborough Community College, Tampa, Florida, March 30, 1995.

42. "And for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the children of the United States today."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Florida State Legislature, Tallahassee, Florida, March 30, 1995.

43. "I am proud of the fact that since I've been President there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks at the Dean B. Ellis Library Dedication, Arkansas State University, Jonesboro, Arkansas, April 3, 1995.

44. "The second thing that we have to pay attention to is the security of our people—our security from attack from abroad, and our security from within. I'm proud of the fact that since I have been president, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of the United States of America."—President Clinton, Remarks to the National Building and Construction Trades Department Conference, Washington, D.C., April 5, 1995.

45. "The American people are marching toward more security because there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of our country for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Dallas, Texas, April 7, 1995.

46. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of the United States of America."—President Clinton, Remarks to California Democratic Party, Sacramento, California, April 8, 1995.

47. "... this is the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age when no Russian missiles are pointed at the children of America. ..."—President Clinton, Remarks at Luncheon with the Jewish Federation, Beverly Hills, California, April 9, 1995.

48. "There are nuclear weapons—large numbers of them now—being destroyed in Russia, weapons from Russian and the states of the former Soviet Union that had them before. And we are destroying weapons. For the first time, there are no Russian nuclear missiles pointed at the United States."—President Clinton, Press Conference, East Room, The White House, April 18, 1995.

49. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at America's children. And those nuclear weapons are being destroyed every day."—President Clinton, Address to the Iowa State Legislature, State Capitol, Des Moines, April 25, 1995.

50. "... no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks to Students at Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, April 25, 1995.

51. "Oh, we knew so clearly when we had the Soviet Union, the Cold War, and the massive nuclear threat. Today, no Soviet Union, no Cold War, and for the first time since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, no Russian missiles are pointed at the children of the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks at World Jewish Congress Dinner, New York, April 30, 1995.

52. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are no Russian missiles pointing at the American people."—President Clinton, Remarks to the White House Conference on Aging, Washington, D.C., May 3, 1995.

53. "Some of you may not know this, but because of the agreement we made last year between the United States and Russia, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the citizens of the United States."—President Clinton, Speech to AIPAC Policy Conference, Washington, D.C., May 7, 1995.

54. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointed at our children."—President Clinton, Remarks at V-E Day Celebration, Fort Myer, Virginia, May 8, 1995.

55. "I am very proud to say that for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointed at the people of the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks at Commencement Ceremony at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, May 8, 1995.

56. "I am proud that for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointed at the children of America. And now that I am here, I might paraphrase what your Foreign Minister told me in Washington last month—I am also proud that no American missiles are pointed at you or me for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Students of Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation, May 10, 1995.

57. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are pointed at the people of the United States of America."—President Clinton, Remarks at a Memorial Day ceremony, Arlington, Virginia, May 29, 1995.

58. "... at the end of the Cold War, the first thing we have to do is to finish the work of removing the nuclear threat. In the last two years we can say for the first time that there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the United States. We are destroying parts of our nuclear arsenal and so are the Russians."—President Clinton, Telephone interview with Colorado Springs Gazette, May 30, 1995.

59. "We are dramatically reducing the nuclear threat. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks at U.S. Air Force Academy Graduation Ceremony, Colorado Springs, May 31, 1995.

60. "I am very proud of the fact that in the last two years, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States of America."—President Clinton, Remarks at the Dartmouth College Commencement, Hanover, New Hampshire, June 11, 1995.

61. "One of the things that I am proudest of is that during our administration, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States. So we're celebrating."—President Clinton, Remarks at Chicago Presidential Gala, Chicago, June 29, 1995.

62. "The Cold War is over. That means we don't have to worry about nuclear annihilation. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at Americans, no American missiles pointed at Russians."—President Clinton, Remarks to the 1995 Annual Convention of the American Association of Physicians From India, Chicago, June 30, 1995.

63. "... agreement with Russia that now mean that both our nations no longer target our missiles at each other."—President Clinton, Announcement of Comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Test Ban, Washington, D.C., August 11, 1995.

64. "I'm proud of the fact that there are no Russian missiles pointed at this country for the first time since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, since our administration came in."—President Clinton, Remarks at Clinton-Gore Fundraiser, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., September 7, 1995.

65. "We don't now fear a bomb dropping on us from the Soviet Union. I am proud to say that since I've been president, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks at the Pennsylvania Presidential Gala, Philadelphia, September 18, 1995.

66. "I'm proud of the fact that there are no Russian missiles pointed at our kids for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Speech at Southern California Presidential Gala, Los Angeles, California, September 21, 1995.

67. "... there are no Russian missiles pointed at our people. ..."—President Clinton, Interview with the San Diego Union-Tribune, en route to San Diego, California, September 22, 1995.

68. "... there are no missiles pointed at the people of the United States since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks at 25th Anniversary Dinner of the Congressional Black Caucus, Washington, D.C., September 23, 1995.

69. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there are now no foreign missiles pointed at the people of the United States of America."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Hispanic Caucus Institute Board and Members, Washington, D.C., September 27, 1995.

70. "Russian nuclear missiles are no longer pointed at our citizens and there are no longer American missiles pointed at their citizens."—President Clinton, Speech to Freedom House, Washington, D.C., October 6, 1995.

71. "And America has been gratified to be a part of making peace in the Middle East, progress in Northern Ireland, the cease-fire in Bosnia, making sure that for the first

time since the dawn of the nuclear age there aren't any missiles pointed at Americans or their children tonight."—President Clinton, Speech to the Business Council, Williamsburg Inn, Williamsburg, Virginia, October 13, 1995.

72. "... and I tell you there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age because of the things that we've been doing. ..."—President Clinton, Remarks at Presidential Gala Luncheon, Meridien Hotel, Dallas, Texas, October 16, 1995.

73. "There are no Russian missiles pointed at anyone in America for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks at Presidential Gala Dinner, Westin Galleria Hotel, Houston, Texas, October 17, 1995.

74. "... America is safer tonight because we didn't give up our leadership, because we are in a situation where we're destroying nuclear missiles more rapidly. And for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single, solitary nuclear missile pointed at an American child tonight. Not one. Not one. Not a single one."—President Clinton, Remarks at Iowa Jefferson-Jackson Dinner, Des Moines, October 20, 1995.

75. "The United States has made a real contribution to the march of freedom, democracy and peace, in accelerating the dismantling of our nuclear weapons so that now, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there's not a single nuclear missile pointed at a single American citizen."—President Clinton, Remarks at Dedication of the National Czech and Slovak Museum, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, October 21, 1995.

76. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there's not a single solitary nuclear missile pointed at the people of the United States of America. And I'm proud of that."—President Clinton, Remarks to the AFL-CIO Convention, New York, October 23, 1995.

77. "We can be very thankful that on this Veterans Day, for their first time since the dawn of the nuclear era, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of America."—President Clinton, Remarks at Wreath-Laying Ceremony, Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, November 11, 1995.

78. "For the first time since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, there is not a single nuclear missile pointed at an American child."—Remarks to the Democratic Leadership Council, Washington, D.C., November 13, 1995.

79. "For the very first time since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, there is not a single Russian missile pointed at an American child."—President Clinton, Remarks in satellite feed to Florida Democratic Party Convention, Little Rock, Arkansas, December 10, 1995.

80. "I am proud of the fact there are no Russian missiles pointed at any Americans during this administration for the first time since the end of the Cold War."—President Clinton, Dinner for the National Democratic Club, Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington, January 9, 1996.

81. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single, solitary nuclear missile pointed at an American child, and I am proud of that."—President Clinton, Remarks at Clinton-Gore Luncheon, Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee, January 12, 1996.

82. "I am proud of the fact that, with the leadership of the Vice President, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single nuclear missile pointed at an American child today."—President Clinton, To Workers of the Peterbilt Truck Plant, Nashville, January 12, 1996.

83. "For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age—for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age—there is not a single Russian missile pointed at America's children."—President Clinton, State of the Union address, January 23, 1996.

84. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at our people."—President Clinton, Statement on Senate Ratification of the START II Treaty, January 26, 1996.

85. "You look at the fact that we now have almost 180 nations committed not to get involved in the nuclear arms race, and the fact that the Russians and others have detargeted their nuclear missiles so that now there are no more nuclear missiles pointed at any American homes for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks to the People of the Salem Area, Salem, New Hampshire, February 2, 1996.

86. "... for the first time in the last two-and-a-half years, for the first time since the dawn of the Nuclear Age, there is not a single nuclear missile pointed at an American city, an American family, an American child. That is not being done any more."—President Clinton, Remarks to Students, Parents and Teachers of the Concord Schools Community, Concord, New Hampshire, February 2, 1996.

87. "... people see that there are no Russian missiles pointed at our children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age. ..."—President Clinton, Remarks at Louisiana Economic Development Brunch, Washington, D.C., February 9, 1996.

88. "I'm grateful that there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the United States any more."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Iowa City Community, Iowa, February 10, 1996.

89. "... let's look at the march of the world toward peace after the Cold War. There are no nuclear missiles pointed at the people of the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks to the People of Des Moines, February 11, 1996.

90. "There are no more nuclear missiles pointed at any children in the United States. I'm proud of that."—President Clinton, Remarks at Presidential Gala, Sheraton New York, New York City, February 15, 1996.

91. "I asked you to give me a chance to try to give America a more secure future and a more peaceful, more democratic world. And the fact that there are not nuclear missiles pointed at any American children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age is evidence of that commitment."—President Clinton, Remarks to the People of Southeast New Hampshire, Rochester, New Hampshire, February 17, 1996.

92. "We won the Cold War, and there are no missiles pointed at the United States or any of its people tonight."—President Clinton, Speech to the people of Manchester, New Hampshire, February 17, 1996.

93. "More than anything else I am grateful that now there is not a single nuclear weapon pointed at any American citizen."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Community in Keene, New Hampshire, February 17, 1996.

94. "We won the Cold War. There are no missiles pointed at America's children."—President Clinton, Telephone speech to the National Emergency Management Association, February 26, 1996.

95. "... I am proud of the fact that there are no Russian missiles pointed at the United States."—President Clinton, Speech at Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Dinner, St. Regis Hotel, New York City, March 11, 1996.

96. "There's not a single nuclear warhead pointed at an American citizen today, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age,

and I am proud of that."—President Clinton, Remarks at Dedication Ceremony of the New Nashville Wharf, Port of New Orleans, March 18, 1996.

97. "Today, there are no Russian missiles pointed at our cities and citizens."—President Clinton, Address to Members of the University of Central Oklahoma Community, April 5, 1996.

98. "Because of my agreement with President Yeltsin, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, no Russian missiles are targeted at United States cities."—President Clinton, News Conference in Moscow, Russia, April 20, 1996.

99. "... Russian and American missiles are not pointed at each other's cities or citizens."—President Clinton, News Conference with Russian President Boris Yeltsin, Moscow, Russia, April 21, 1996.

100. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age there is not a single, solitary nuclear missile pointed at an American child tonight. And I am proud of that and you should be proud of that."—President Clinton, Remarks to a Democratic Reception at the Franklin Institute, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 26, 1996.

101. "There are no nuclear missiles pointed at America's children for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Speech to the Democratic National Dinner, Coral Gables, Florida, April 29, 1996.

102. "... there are no Russian missiles pointed at our cities or our citizens."—President Clinton, Commencement address to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, May 22, 1996.

103. "I have made reducing the nuclear threat one of my highest priorities. As a result, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at our people."—President Clinton, Statement on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, June 28, 1996.

104. "I'm proud of the fact that there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Speech to the Northern California Democratic National Committee Gala, San Francisco, July 23, 1996.

105. "Today not a single Russian missile is pointed at our citizens or cities."—President Clinton, Speech at the George Washington University, Washington, D.C., August 5, 1996.

106. "If the test is, no nuclear missiles pointed at the American people for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, we're better off."—President Clinton, Speech to the Saxophone Club, Armand Hammer Museum of Art, Santa Monica, California, August 9, 1996.

107. "We've got a more peaceful world where there are no nuclear missiles pointed at the people of the United States since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Citizens of Ashland, Kentucky, August 25, 1996.

108. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, on this night, this beautiful night, there is not a single nuclear missile pointed at a child in the United States of America."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Citizens of Toledo, Ohio, August 26, 1996.

109. "I am proud to say that tonight there is not a single Russian nuclear missile pointed at an American child."—President Clinton, Speech accepting his nomination to run for a second term, Democratic National Committee Convention, Chicago, August 29, 1996.

110. "We finally succeed in removing most of the nuclear weapons from any place within the old Soviet Union. There are no nuclear missiles pointed at the children of the United States tonight for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Citizens of St. Louis, Missouri, September 10, 1996.

111. "... today no Russian missiles are pointed at our cities or our citizens."—President Clinton, Remarks to reporters upon departure from Kansas City International Airport, September 10, 1996.

112. "... for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age in the last four years, there's not a single nuclear missile pointed at the children of America."—President Clinton, Speech to the Community of the Sun City Area, Sun City, Arizona, September 11, 1996.

113. "I'm proud of the fact that there are no nuclear missiles pointed at America's children since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Speech to the Rancho Cucamonga Community, Rancho Cucamonga, California, September 12, 1996.

114. "Today, there are no Russian missiles pointed at America, and no American missiles pointed at Russia."—President Clinton, Speech to the 51st General Assembly of the United Nations, New York, September 24, 1996.

115. "There are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of the United States."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Citizens of Freehold, New Jersey, September 24, 1996.

116. "There are no Russian missiles pointed at America for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Speech to the Citizens of Fort Worth, Texas, September 27, 1996.

117. "There are no nuclear missiles pointed at the children of the United States tonight and have not been in our administration for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Debate with Senator Bob Dole, Hartford Connecticut, October 6, 1996.

118. "... we have reduced the nuclear danger to Americans, and today there are no Russian nuclear missiles targeted at our children."—President Clinton, Response to Readers' Questions, USA Today, October 8, 1996.

119. "Today, no Russian missiles are pointed at America's children."—President Clinton, Remarks on Fox Network's Free Campaign Air Time, October 12, 1996.

120. "... today not a single Russian missile targets America. We are cutting our nuclear arsenals by two-thirds."—President Clinton, Speech to the People of the Detroit Area, Detroit, Michigan, October 22, 1996.

121. "... today, as we stand here in Macon, Georgia, there are no Russian missiles targeted at the United States of America."—President Clinton, Speech to the People of the Macon Area, Macon, Georgia, October 25, 1996.

122. "... there are no Russian missiles targeted at the young people of the United States of America."—President Clinton, Speech to the People of the Atlanta Area, Atlanta, Georgia, October 25, 1996.

123. "You just think—just think about this world we're moving into—the Cold War in the background, no Russian missiles pointed at the children of the United States for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Speech to the People of the Chicago Area, Chicago, Illinois, October 28, 1996.

124. "But we are standing up for peace and freedom and there's not a single Russian missile pointed at an American child tonight in part because of what we're doing."—President Clinton, Speech to the People of the Denver Area, Denver, Colorado, October 30, 1996.

125. "America is stronger today than it was four years ago. No Russian missiles are pointed at our children today, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, and we're moving in the right direction there."—President Clinton, Speech to the People of the Las Vegas Area, Las Vegas, Nevada, October 31, 1996.

126. "I know that I've been criticized for some of the things that I've tried to do, but I know that there are no Russian missiles pointed at the children of America for the first time since the dawn of the cold war."—President Clinton, Remarks at Santa Barbara City College, Santa Barbara, California, November 1, 1996.

127. "Today there's not a single Russian nuclear missile pointed at an American child."—President Clinton, Remarks on Dateline NBC's "Presidential Face-Off," November 1, 1996.

128. "If I were a Republican president—after all the rhetoric they've used—with ... no Russian missiles pointed at our kids, by the way; and a stronger America with a stronger military, they'd be saying it's morning in America."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Citizens of San Antonio, Texas, November 2, 1996.

129. "... there are no Russian missiles pointed at any American children tonight for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age."—President Clinton, Speech to the People of the Springfield Area, Springfield, Massachusetts, November 3, 1996.

130. "... we must move strongly against new threats to our security. ... With Russia, we dramatically cut nuclear arsenals and we stopped targeting each other's citizens."—President Clinton, State of the Union Address, February 4, 1997.

Compiled by the American Foreign Policy Council, 1521 16th Street NW, Washington, DC 20036 USA.

—
"Today there's not a single Russian nuclear missile pointed at an American child."—President Clinton, Remarks by President Clinton on Dateline NBC's "Presidential Face-Off," November 1, 1996

"If I were a Republican President—after all the rhetoric they've used—with ... no Russian missiles pointed at our kids, by the way; and a stronger America with a stronger military, they'd be saying it's morning in America."—President Clinton, Remarks to the Citizens of San Antonio, Texas, November 2, 1996

VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE

"Less than three weeks ago, for the first time in almost fifty years, nuclear missiles were no longer targeted on American cities."—Vice President Gore, Commencement Speech at Harvard University, June 9, 1994

"We've seen ... the taking of Russian missiles off alert so that for the first time in my lifetime no Russian missiles are targeted on American soil."—Vice President Gore, Interview with Tim Russert on "Meet the Press," September 4, 1994

"Today, Russian missiles are no longer targeted at America's cities or homes."—Vice President Gore, Remarks at U.S. Military Academy at West Point, October 17, 1995

"And our strength at home has led to renewed respect abroad: nuclear missiles no longer pointed at our cities ..."—Vice President Gore, Speech to the Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Illinois, August 28, 1996

(FORMER) NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR ANTHONY LAKE

"Our rhetoric must not outpace reality. When it does, we risk creating a climate of disillusion like the one that descended upon us in the 1920s ... As a result of our engagement Russian missiles no longer target American cities or citizens."—Anthony Lake, Remarks in "Woodrow Wilson Speech", as quoted in Department of State Dispatch, December 5, 1994

"... without that relationship, the Presidents, Clinton and Yeltsin, would not have been able to negotiate the agreement which

now results in there not being American and Russian missiles targeted at each other."—Anthony Lake, Statements at White House Press Briefing, May 11, 1995

"Today, American cities and American citizens no longer live under direct targeting of Russian missiles."—Anthony Lake, Speech at George Washington University, March 8, 1996

"Today, because of our steady engagement America's cities and America's families are no longer targeted by Russian missiles."—Anthony Lake, Speech to the U.S./Russia Business Council, Washington, DC, April 1, 1996

"Today, because of our engagement with Russia and the new independent states, America's cities and families are no longer targeted by Russia's missiles."—Anthony Lake, Remarks at Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, April 25, 1996

"Because of our steady engagement with Russia and the new independent states, no Russian missiles are targeted at America's cities or citizens."—Anthony Lake, Speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, May 24, 1996

"Then: Russia's missiles were targeted at American cities and citizens; now: their detargeting has eliminated the risk to us of an accidental launch."—Anthony Lake, Speech at the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, October 7, 1996

(FORMER) SECRETARY OF STATE WARREN CHRISTOPHER

"Russian missiles are no longer targeted on us."—Warren Christopher, Speech on Year End Review of U.S. Foreign Policy as quoted in Department of State Dispatch, January 2, 1995

"... we need to remember the tremendous advantage there is in no longer having Russian or Soviet missiles targeted on the United States."—Warren Christopher, Interview with Associated Press, May 5, 1995

"Our cooperation has produced a number of things for the American people—most dramatically, the reduction in our nuclear arsenals and the absence of any nuclear missiles being targeted at the United States."—Warren Christopher, Remarks with Russian Foreign Minister Primakov, Helsinki, Finland, February 10, 1996

"Today, Russian missiles are no longer targeted on our cities."—Warren Christopher, Statement to the House International Relations Committee, July 31, 1996

(FORMER) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM PERRY

"Russia's nuclear missiles are no longer aimed at us, nor are our missiles targeted on them."—William Perry, Commentary Piece in Los Angeles Times, May 10, 1995

DEPUTY NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR SAMUEL BERGER

"Because of President Clinton's agreement with President Yeltsin, Russian missiles no longer target American cities."—Samuel Berger, Remarks at the Wilson Center, June 18, 1996

PRESS SECRETARY MICHAEL MCCURRY

"... we don't have Russian strategic intercontinental missiles aimed at the United States any more."—Michael McCurry, Remarks at Press Briefing, March 10, 1995

Secretary of State Madeline Albright—Madeline Albright, Statements Before House International Relations Committee, ??? February 12, 1996

—
ED BRADLEY: Is there verification on both sides?

GENERAL SERGEYEV: No, we don't have these kind of systems of verification or control. For the first time, we do it on total confidence to one another.

ED BRADLEY: So, we take your word, you take our word?

GENERAL SERGEYEV: Yes.

ED BRADLEY: This is a Russian topal being test fired, able to reach its old U.S. targets in just 30 minutes. We're told that they're no longer aimed at America, but how much comfort can we take from that?

How long will it take to re-target?

GENERAL SERGEYEV: The same period of time it will take the Americans to do it. Same time.

ED BRADLEY: Minutes? Hours?

"It depends on the missile," he told us, but for most, only a matter of minutes.

GENERAL SERGEYEV: Yes, we can return it all back to the way it was.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 169, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 169, it is now in order to consider the amendment printed in section 8(e) of House Resolution 169.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of subtitle C of title X (page 326, after line 6), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1032. ASSIGNMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PERSONNEL TO ASSIST IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE AND CUSTOMS SERVICE.

(a) ASSIGNMENT AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 374 the following new section:

§ 374a. Assignment of personnel to assist border patrol and control

"(a) ASSIGNMENT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may assign up to 10,000 Department of Defense personnel at any one time to assist—

"(1) the Immigration and Naturalization Service in preventing the entry of terrorists, drug traffickers, and illegal aliens into the United States; and

"(2) the United States Customs Service in the inspection of cargo, vehicles, and aircraft at points of entry into the United States.

"(b) REQUEST FOR ASSIGNMENT.—The assignment of Department of Defense personnel under subsection (a) may only occur—

"(1) at the request of the Attorney General, in the case of an assignment to the Immigration and Naturalization Service; and

"(2) at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of an assignment to the United States Customs Service."

"(c) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 377 of this title shall apply in the

case of Department of Defense personnel assigned under subsection (a)."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 374 the following new item:

"374a. Assignment of personnel to assist border patrol and control."

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding section 2(e) of this resolution, the additional period of general debate on the subject of United States forces in Bosnia shall precede the offering of amendments numbered 8 and 9 in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules rather than the amendments numbered 1 and 2 in part 1 of the report.

The Chairman. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] seek the 5 minutes in opposition?

Mr. DELLUMS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California, [Mr. DUNCAN HUNTER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT]. We have had more shootings on the southwest border in the last several weeks. In fact, we had two attempted shootings yesterday from across the border. One border patrolman has been hit so far. We have had more violence there and more gunfire exchanged than we have had in Bosnia in the same period of time.

What this allows us to do is, on request of the Attorney General, in the case where you have a national security problem for the Attorney General to request up to 10,000 military personnel at the southwest border. I think it is prudent. It requires a request of the Attorney General. Obviously, it is at the discretion of the Commander in Chief.

I strongly support the Traficant amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. REYES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Traficant amendment this morning. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is adopted, the Department of Defense will be allowed to send 10,000 troops to

our southern border. With more than 26 years of experience in the U.S. Border Patrol, I can tell the Members that this is a very, very bad idea.

Exactly 1 month ago today a young 18-year-old boy was shot and killed by a Marine assisting the Border Patrol in Redford, TX. Ezequiel Hernandez is the first American killed by troops on U.S. soil since 1970, in the Kent State incident. Unfortunately, we cannot do anything to bring him back, but we can and we should do everything we can to keep this from happening again.

We already have almost 7,000 Border Patrol agents patrolling our Nation's border. Congress, this Congress, has authorized an additional 1,000 agents every year until the year 2001. What we need to do is make sure that these men and women are professional, bilingual, well-trained law enforcement officers, properly trained to deal with situations and problems along our border.

Their mission is dramatically different from the mission of the U.S. military. It does not make any sense to me or any of my former colleagues in the U.S. Border Patrol to put 10,000 troops on the southern border. By putting armed troops on our border, we will be forced to deal with a new set of problems: Problems of jurisdiction, problems of authority, and problems of responsibility and personal liability for those troops.

Mr. Chairman, this body should focus its time and energy on giving the Border Patrol the resources they need, instead of jeopardizing our troops and civilians alike. The cost of doing this is, furthermore, outrageous. According to our own Department of Defense, if this amendment is adopted, it will cost the U.S. taxpayers \$650 million a year to deploy 10,000 troops to our southern border. The military already spends more than \$800 million per year assisting law enforcement with drug interdiction and border security, mostly through support and high-tech equipment.

For example, the U.S. Air Force provides AWACs aircraft to monitor the southwest border. Some of these missions are dedicated solely to detecting drug traffickers. Last year, the AWACs provided information that led up to a seizure of 945 million dollars worth of cocaine. That is about 35 percent of the cocaine intercepted into the United States.

This issue that we are talking about here with the Traficant amendment is dramatically different. We are talking about putting troops to patrol our border, and jeopardizing citizens in the districts such as mine that I represent along the border with Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I think, finally, that since the end of the cold war the military's mission deployments have increased by about 300 percent. We are doing this with a substantially reduced number of soldiers. We cannot and should not be able to afford to pull 10,000 men and women away from other

missions, and further adding to the aggravation and pain of family separation, to help the efforts of the U.S. Border Patrol that is already provided for by this Congress.

□ 1300

I strongly urge my colleagues to remember that I have 26½ years of experience along our border fighting drug trafficking and illegal immigration. I think this is the wrong thing to do at the wrong time.

The Attorney General does not support this amendment. The Secretary of the Treasury does not support this amendment. The Commissioner of INS does not support this amendment, and neither do the colleagues that I worked with for 26½ years.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, if you have any influence, please beam this gentleman up.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak directly to the gentleman from Texas, because I support 99.9 percent of his position.

I have fought against military on the border. If they get to anywhere close to what your fears are, the perception, which I do not think is a reality, of this amendment, I will stand there toe to toe with you in my word to fight against exactly your fears.

This amendment does not do that, in my opinion. The gentleman is one of, if not one of, I think the most respected expert on border patrol issues. I would say that up front. But we do have a lot of different agencies working with us. I would oppose a marine with a rifle that does not know the difference between alto and stop. My whole opinion is, we need more border patrol that are trained to help civil rights and do those kinds of things. But I do believe in the secondary missions and in the cases where not that we are saying put 10,000, I would oppose that now today, but where we need to protect our people from being fired at, at the Government, the people that are opposing, they have the right to say that, that to protect our border patrol, I would support it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Let me point out again, Mr. Chairman, this does not mandate that these resources be put at the border. It only allows them to be put at the border if the administration determines it needs to be done.

Let me tell my colleagues, as someone who lives within a quarter mile of the border, my children and my wife are in that neighborhood today. It is quite unfair and quite inappropriate for us to say that our U.S. capabilities will defend the neighborhoods of every nation in the world, but we will not defend the neighborhoods of south San Diego.

Mr. Chairman, I have here the record of 251 Members of Congress who voted that Mexico is not doing enough on drug interdiction; 250 Members of Congress who pointed fingers at Mexico and said they need to do more.

Mr. Chairman, Mexico has put troops at the border because that is what it takes to stop the drug traffic. All this amendment says, if the President feels that it needs to be done, he is authorized to do that. As somebody who is at the border every weekend, let me point out it is getting more violent. American agents are being shot from a foreign country. We are getting people killed along the border today. All this does is prepare the way that, if the administration sees a crisis, that crisis can be addressed with American resources.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] is recognized for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not mandate troops on the border. It is only an option. Those troops, if they go to the border, cannot make an arrest. They must only detain.

I appreciate the fine gentleman who was in the border patrol. But poor illegal immigrants coming from Central America are not bribing Customs, and they are not bribing the border patrol. I am talking about narcoterrorists, Congress. You talk about a drug war. We have got kids overdosing on the nod in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Youngstown. When are we going to fight? Enough is enough. They do not go to the border unless there is an emergency. And our President said, we need 25,000 more border patrol agents to secure our border. We are paying money to secure the borders in Bosnia. We are paying money to secure the borders all around the world, and we are going to hell literally.

I am tired of all the ethnic comments being made here. I want to help every one of those people in Central America. Those who can come here legally, come in. But do not come in illegally. But that is not my focus.

We are not going to stop these big narcotic kingpins with the program we have been operating. My colleagues know it and I know it. Now we have a chance for the debate. This amendment came up rather quickly, before Members could have a chance to really study this baby. I want their vote.

If they stand for stomping out narcotics, cocaine, heroin in this country, then stand up today. I hear all this big mouth rhetoric. Stand up today. This is not about the border patrol; it is not about Central Americans. This is about our national security. And dammit, if we are not going to act here today, there will be no opportunity to act.

I would say one last thing about cost: What do Members think 25,000 border

patrol are going to cost? We have got our troops cashing checks in Tokyo, going to dinner in Frankfurt. We are overrun with narcotics here. Enough is enough.

I am asking for an aye vote, and I am asking for those leaders who may feel disposed, because of the White House's position, to stand tall today. If it was up to the White House, who the hell knows what would be going on.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say, in the brief time that I have got left, that this is not an emotional argument. This is an argument that needs rationality.

This is an argument where we need to vote against this amendment because those very people that are enforcing our laws on our southern border are not in favor of this amendment. We do not need it. We do not want it. We should not tolerate this kind of rhetoric on the floor of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 169, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 169, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Part 1 amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER]; part 2 amendment No. 22 offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY]; part 2 amendment No. 41 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON]; and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. LUTHER.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 253, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

AYES—145

Abercrombie	Gutknecht	Nadler
Allen	Hall (OH)	Neumann
Baldacci	Hilliard	Norwood
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Nussle
Becerra	Hobson	Obey
Bentsen	Hoekstra	Owens
Berman	Hoolley	Pallone
Blagojevich	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Paul
Bonior	(TX)	Payne
Brown (OH)	Johnson (WI)	Pelosi
Camp	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Campbell	Kelly	Petri
Capps	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Cardin	Kildee	Poshard
Carson	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Coble	Kind (WI)	Ramstad
Collins	Kleczka	Rangel
Conyers	Klink	Rivers
Costello	Klug	Roemer
Coyne	Kucinich	Rohrabacher
Cummings	LaFalce	Rothman
Danner	Lampson	Roukema
Davis (FL)	Lantos	Rush
Davis (IL)	Latham	Sabo
DeFazio	Leach	Sanchez
Delahunt	Levin	Sanders
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	LoBiondo	Serrano
Doggett	Lofgren	Shays
Dooley	Lowey	Skaggs
Doyle	Luther	Slaughter
Duncan	Maloney (NY)	Stabenow
Ehrlich	Manton	Stokes
English	Markey	Strickland
Eshoo	Mascara	Stupak
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Tierney
Fattah	McDermott	Towns
Filner	McGovern	Upton
Foglietta	McHale	Velazquez
Foley	McKinney	Vento
Ford	Meehan	Waters
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Waxman
Goodlatte	Mink	Wexler
Green	Moakley	Woolsey
Greenwood	Moran (VA)	Wynn
Gutierrez	Morella	

NOES—253

Aderholt	Cook	Granger
Andrews	Cox	Hall (TX)
Archer	Cramer	Hamilton
Armey	Crane	Hansen
Bachus	Crapo	Harman
Baesler	Cubin	Hastert
Baker	Cunningham	Hastings (FL)
Barcia	Davis (VA)	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Deal	Hayworth
Bartlett	DeLauro	Hefley
Barton	DeLay	Hefner
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Bateman	Dickey	Hill
Bereuter	Dicks	Hilleary
Berry	Dixon	Hinojosa
Bilbray	Dreier	Holden
Bilirakis	Dunn	Horn
Bishop	Edwards	Hostettler
Blunt	Emerson	Houghton
Boehlert	Engel	Hoyer
Boehner	Ensign	Hulshof
Bonilla	Etheridge	Hunter
Bono	Everett	Hutchinson
Borski	Ewing	Hyde
Boswell	Fawell	Inglis
Boucher	Fazio	Istook
Boyd	Flake	Jefferson
Brady	Forbes	Jenkins
Brown (FL)	Fowler	John
Bryant	Fox	Johnson (CT)
Bunning	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, E. B.
Burr	Frost	Jones
Burton	Galleghy	Kaptur
Callahan	Ganske	Kasich
Calvert	Gejdenson	Kennedy (RI)
Canady	Gekas	Kennelly
Cannon	Gibbons	Kim
Castle	Gilchrest	King (NY)
Chabot	Gillmor	Kingston
Chambliss	Gilman	Knollenberg
Christensen	Gonzalez	Kolbe
Clement	Goode	LaHood
Clyburn	Goodling	LaTourette
Combest	Gordon	Lazio
Condit	Graham	Lewis (CA)

Lewis (KY)	Pickett	Smith (TX)
Linder	Pitts	Smith, Adam
Livingston	Portman	Smith, Linda
Lucas	Pryce (OH)	Snowbarger
Maloney (CT)	Quinn	Snyder
Manzullo	Radanovich	Solomon
Martinez	Redmond	Souder
Matsui	Regula	Spence
McCollum	Reyes	Spratt
McDade	Riggs	Stearns
McHugh	Riley	Stenholm
McInnis	Rodriguez	Stump
McIntyre	Rogan	Sununu
McKeon	Rogers	Talent
McNulty	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Meek	Roybal-Allard	Taylor (MS)
Metcalfe	Royce	Thomas
Mica	Ryun	Thompson
Millender-	Salmon	Thornberry
McDonald	Sandlin	Thune
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Thurman
Molinar	Sawyer	Tiahrt
Mollohan	Saxton	Trafficant
Moran (KS)	Scarborough	Turner
Murtha	Schaefer, Dan	Visclosky
Myrick	Schaffer, Bob	Walsh
Neal	Schumer	Wamp
Ney	Scott	Watkins
Northup	Sessions	Watts (OK)
Oliver	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Ortiz	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Oxley	Sherman	Weller
Packard	Shimkus	Weygand
Pappas	Shuster	White
Parker	Sisisky	Whitfield
Pascarella	Skeen	Wicker
Paxon	Skelton	Wolf
Pease	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
Peterson (PA)	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Pickering	Smith (OR)	

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman	Deutsch	Nethercutt
Ballenger	Doolittle	Oberstar
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Pombo
Bliley	Furse	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Gephardt	Rahall
Buyer	Goss	Schiff
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Stark
Clay	Largent	Tauzin
Clayton	Lipinski	Taylor (NC)
Coburn	McCrery	Torres
Cooksey	McIntosh	Wise
DeGette	Miller (CA)	Yates

□ 1327

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rahall for, with Mr. Deutsch against.
Mr. Stark for, with Mr. McIntosh against.

Messrs. CRANE, METCALF, MILLER of Florida, and NEAL of Massachusetts changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Ms. CARSON, Messrs. PAYNE, RUSH and HILLIARD, and Mrs. KELLY, changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 248, noes 146, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

AYES—248

Abercrombie	Gilchrest	Pappas
Aderholt	Goodling	Paul
Archer	Gordon	Paxon
Armey	Graham	Payne
Bachus	Granger	Pease
Baker	Green	Peterson (PA)
Baldacci	Greenwood	Petri
Barr	Gutknecht	Pickering
Bartlett	Hall (OH)	Pickett
Barton	Hansen	Pitts
Bass	Harman	Portman
Bereuter	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Radanovich
Bishop	Hefley	Ramstad
Blunt	Herger	Redmond
Boehlert	Hill	Regula
Bonilla	Hilleary	Reyes
Bono	Hinojosa	Riggs
Boswell	Hobson	Riley
Boucher	Hoolley	Rogan
Boyd	Horn	Rogers
Brady	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Brown (FL)	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Roukema
Bryant	Hulshof	Royce
Burr	Hunter	Ryun
Burton	Hutchinson	Salmon
Calvert	Inglis	Sandlin
Camp	Istook	Sanford
Campbell	Jefferson	Saxton
Canady	Jenkins	Scarborough
Cannon	John	Schaefer, Dan
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Schaffer, Bob
Cardin	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Carson	Kasich	Sessions
Castle	Kelly	Shadegg
Chabot	Kennedy (RI)	Shaw
Chambliss	Kim	Shays
Christensen	Kingston	Shimkus
Clement	Klug	Shuster
Clyburn	Knollenberg	Skaggs
Coble	Kolbe	Skeen
Combest	LaFalce	Skelton
Condit	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Cook	Lampson	Smith (NJ)
Costello	Latham	Smith (OR)
Cox	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lazio	Smith, Adam
Crane	Levin	Smith, Linda
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Snowbarger
Cummings	Lewis (KY)	Snyder
Cunningham	Linder	Solomon
Danner	Livingston	Souder
Deal	LoBiondo	Stearns
DeLay	Lucas	Stenholm
Diaz-Balart	Maloney (NY)	Stump
Dickey	Manzullo	Stupak
Dicks	Martinez	Sununu
Dixon	Matsui	Talent
Dooley	McCollum	Tanner
Dreier	McDade	Tauscher
Duncan	McHale	Thomas
Dunn	McHugh	Thompson
Ehrlich	McInnis	Thornberry
Emerson	McIntyre	Thune
English	McKeon	Thurman
Ensign	Metcalfe	Tiahrt
Eshoo	Mica	Towns
Ewing	Millender-	Trafficant
Farr	McDonald	Turner
Fawell	Miller (FL)	Upton
Fazio	Molinar	Walsh
Flake	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Foley	Morella	Watkins
Fowler	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Fox	Neumann	Weldon (PA)
Frank (MA)	Northup	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	White
Frelinghuysen	Nussle	Whitfield
Galleghy	Ortiz	Wicker
Gekas	Oxley	Wolf
Gibbons	Packard	Young (AK)

NOES—146

Allen	Baesler	Barrett (WI)
Andrews	Barcia	Bateman

Becerra	Hilliard	Neal
Bentsen	Hinchey	Ney
Berman	Hoekstra	Obey
Berry	Holden	Olver
Blagojevich	Hyde	Owens
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Parker
Borski	(TX)	Pascrell
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Callahan	Johnson (WI)	Pelosi
Collins	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Conyers	Kaptur	Porter
Coyne	Kennedy (MA)	Poshard
Crapo	Kennelly	Price (NC)
Davis (FL)	Kildee	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Rivers
Davis (VA)	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
DeFazio	King (NY)	Roemer
Delahunt	Kleczka	Rothman
DeLauro	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Dellums	Kucinich	Rush
Dingell	Lantos	Sabo
Doggett	Leach	Sanchez
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Edwards	Lofgren	Sawyer
Engel	Lowey	Schumer
Etheridge	Luther	Scott
Evans	Maloney (CT)	Serrano
Everett	Manton	Sherman
Fattah	Markey	Sisisky
Filner	Mascara	Slaughter
Foglietta	McCarthy (MO)	Spence
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Ford	McDermott	Stabenow
Frost	McGovern	Strickland
Furse	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Ganske	McNulty	Tierney
Gejdenson	Meehan	Velazquez
Gilman	Meek	Vento
Gonzalez	Menendez	Visclosky
Goode	Minge	Waters
Goodlatte	Mink	Watt (NC)
Gutierrez	Moakley	Waxman
Hall (TX)	Mollohan	Weygand
Hamilton	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Wynn
Hefner	Nadler	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman	Doolittle	Pomeroy
Ballenger	Ehlers	Rahall
Barrett (NE)	Gephardt	Schiff
Bliley	Gillmor	Stark
Boehner	Goss	Stokes
Brown (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Tauzin
Buyer	Largent	Taylor (NC)
Chenoweth	Lipinski	Torres
Clay	McCrery	Weldon (FL)
Clayton	McIntosh	Wexler
Coburn	Miller (CA)	Wise
Cooksey	Nethercutt	Yates
DeGette	Oberstar	
Deutsch	Pombo	

□ 1335

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McIntosh for, with Mr. Stark against.
Ms. DeGette for, Mr. Deutsch against.

Mr. PALLONE and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. SHAYS and Ms. HARMAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 290, noes 100, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—290

Abercrombie	Frost	McHugh
Aderholt	Gallegly	McInnis
Andrews	Ganske	McIntyre
Archer	Gejdenson	McKeon
Army	Gekas	McKinney
Bachus	Gibbons	McNulty
Baessler	Gilchrest	Meehan
Baker	Graham	Menendez
Barr	Granger	Metcalf
Bartlett	Green	Mica
Barton	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Bass	Goodling	Minge
Bateman	Gordon	Molinari
Bentsen	Graham	Moran (KS)
Bereuter	Granger	Morella
Berry	Green	Murtha
Bilbray	Greenwood	Gutierrez
Bilirakis	Gutierrez	Gutknecht
Blagojevich	Hall (OH)	Ney
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Northup
Boehlert	Hansen	Norwood
Bonilla	Harman	Nussle
Bono	Hastert	Ortiz
Boswell	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Boucher	Hayworth	Packard
Boyd	Hefley	Pallone
Brady	Herger	Pappas
Bryant	Hill	Parker
Bunning	Hilleary	Pascrell
Burr	Hinchey	Paul
Burton	Hobson	Paxon
Calvert	Hoekstra	Pease
Camp	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Campbell	Hooley	Peterson (PA)
Canady	Horn	Petri
Cannon	Hostettler	Pickering
Carson	Houghton	Pickett
Castle	Hulshof	Pitts
Chabot	Hunter	Porter
Chambliss	Hutchinson	Portman
Christensen	Hyde	Poshard
Clement	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
Coble	Istook	Quinn
Collins	Jefferson	Radanovich
Combest	Jenkins	Ramstad
Condit	John	Redmond
Cook	Johnson (CT)	Regula
Costello	Jones	Reyes
Cox	Kaptur	Riggs
Cramer	Kasich	Riley
Crane	Kelly	Rivers
Crapo	Kennedy (RI)	Rogan
Cubin	Kennelly	Rogers
Cunningham	Kildee	Rohrabacher
Danner	Kim	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis (FL)	King (NY)	Rothman
Davis (VA)	Kingston	Roukema
Deal	Klink	Royce
DeFazio	Klug	Ryun
DeLay	Knollenberg	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Sanchez
Dickey	Kucinich	Sanders
Dicks	LaFalce	Sanford
Doyle	LaHood	Saxton
Dreier	Lantos	Scarborough
Duncan	Latham	Schaefer, Dan
Dunn	LaTourette	Schaffer, Bob
Edwards	Lazio	Schumer
Ehrlich	Leach	Scott
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
English	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Ensign	Linder	Shadegg
Eshoo	Livingston	Shaw
Everett	LoBiondo	Shays
Ewing	Lucas	Sherman
Farr	Maloney (CT)	Shimkus
Fawell	Maloney (NY)	Shuster
Foley	Manzullo	Sisisky
Forbes	Martinez	Skeen
Ford	Mascara	Skelton
Fowler	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Fox	McCollum	Smith (MI)
Franks (NJ)	McDade	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	McHale	Smith (OR)

Smith (TX)	Sununu	Wamp
Smith, Adam	Talent	Watkins
Smith, Linda	Tanner	Watts (OK)
Snowbarger	Tauscher	Weldon (PA)
Solomon	Taylor (MS)	Weller
Souder	Thomas	White
Spence	Thornberry	Whitfield
Spratt	Thune	Wicker
Stabenow	Thurman	Wolf
Stearns	Trafricant	Wynn
Stenholm	Upton	Young (AK)
Strickland	Visclosky	Young (FL)
Stump	Walsh	

NOES—100

Allen	Furse	Moakley
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Barcia	Hamilton	Moran (VA)
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Becerra	Hefner	Neal
Berman	Hilliard	Obey
Bishop	Hinojosa	Olver
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Owens
Bonior	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Pelosi
Capps	Johnson (WI)	Price (NC)
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Conyers	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Coyne	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Rush
Davis (IL)	Kleczka	Sabo
Delahunt	Lampson	Sawyer
DeLauro	Levin	Serrano
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Dingell	Lofgren	Snyder
Dixon	Lowey	Stupak
Doggett	Luther	Thompsonson
Dooley	Manton	Tierney
Engel	Markey	Towns
Etheridge	Matsui	Turner
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Velazquez
Fattah	McDermott	Vento
Fazio	McGovern	Waters
Filner	Meek	Watt (NC)
Flake	Millender	Waxman
Foglietta	McDonald	Weygand
Frank (MA)	Mink	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—44

Ackerman	Deutsch	Pomeroy
Ballenger	Doolittle	Rahall
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Sandlin
Bliley	Gephardt	Schiff
Boehner	Gillmor	Stark
Brown (CA)	Goss	Stokes
Brown (OH)	Johnson, Sam	Tauzin
Buyer	Largent	Taylor (NC)
Callahan	Lipinski	Tiahrt
Chenoweth	McCrery	Torres
Clay	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Clayton	Miller (CA)	Wexler
Coburn	Nethercutt	Wise
Cooksey	Oberstar	Yates
DeGette	Pombo	

□ 1342

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McIntosh for, with Mr. Stark against.

Mr. FORD changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 223, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 223, the Weldon amendment, I would like for the RECORD to reflect that I was in the House, in the Chamber available to vote; I signaled the Chair to vote. As I approached, the vote was closed despite my signaling.

I want the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted "aye." I was available to vote, in the Chamber.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 119, answered "present" 1, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

AYES—269

Abercrombie	Ensign	LaHood
Aderholt	Eshoo	Lantos
Andrews	Etheridge	Latham
Archer	Everett	LaTourette
Armey	Fattah	Lazio
Bachus	Fawell	Leach
Baesler	Flake	Levin
Baker	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Barcia	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Barr	Fowler	Livingston
Bartlett	Fox	LoBiondo
Barton	Franks (NJ)	Lowe
Bass	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bateman	Frost	Luther
Bereuter	Galleghy	Maloney (CT)
Bilbray	Gekas	Maloney (NY)
Bilirakis	Gibbons	Manton
Bishop	Gilchrest	Manzullo
Blunt	Gilman	Mascara
Boehlert	Goode	McCarthy (MO)
Bono	Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)
Boswell	Goodling	McCollum
Boucher	Gordon	McDade
Boyd	Graham	McHugh
Brady	Granger	McInnis
Bryant	Greenwood	McIntyre
Bunning	Gutknecht	McKeon
Burr	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Burton	Hall (TX)	Metcalfe
Calvert	Hansen	Mica
Camp	Harman	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Hastert	Minge
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Moakley
Castle	Hefley	Molinari
Chabot	Hefner	Moran (KS)
Chambliss	Herger	Morella
Christensen	Hill	Myrick
Clement	Hilleary	Neumann
Clyburn	Hobson	Ney
Coble	Hoekstra	Northup
Collins	Holden	Norwood
Combust	Horn	Nussle
Condit	Hostettler	Obey
Cook	Hulshof	Owens
Costello	Hunter	Oxley
Cox	Hutchinson	Packard
Cramer	Hyde	Pallone
Crane	Inglis	Pappas
Crapo	Istook	Parker
Cubin	Jefferson	Pascarell
Cummings	Jenkins	Paxon
Cunningham	John	Pease
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)
Davis (VA)	Jones	Peterson (PA)
Deal	Kaptur	Petri
DeLay	Kasich	Pickering
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Pickett
Dickey	Kim	Pitts
Dicks	Kind (WI)	Porter
Doyle	King (NY)	Portman
Dreier	Kingston	Poshard
Duncan	Klink	Price (NC)
Dunn	Klug	Pryce (OH)
Emerson	Knollenberg	Quinn
Engel	Kucinich	Radanovich
English	LaFalce	Ramstad

Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Sununu

Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

rollcalls No. 222, 223, and 224. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 222, the Hefley amendment, "aye" on rollcall 223, the Weldon amendment, and "aye" on rollcall 224, the Traficant amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained today during rollcall vote Nos. 220, 223, and 224. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on each of these votes.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me just announce on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] what his intent is for the schedule for debate of amendments next week with respect to the rest of the National Security bill.

On Monday afternoon, after doing suspensions and any other necessary business, it is his desire to continue with the consideration of amendments to H.R. 1119; and it is further his intent to have the following amendments debated during Monday afternoon with the votes rolled until after 5 p.m. Monday afternoon.

That is the Frank amendment on NATO expansion, amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. GILMAN on POW-MIA issues, amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. BUYER and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island on Persian Gulf illness, and possibly an en bloc package of amendments from part 2 of the rule that have been worked out and are acceptable to the committee.

Then, after voting, around the 5 p.m. time frame, it is further his intent to resume the consideration of amendments from part 1 of the rule as late into Monday evening as the schedule will permit; and it is his hope to finish consideration of amendments on Monday evening, and that would mean considering the following amendments on Monday evening after the 5 p.m. votes. That is amendment No. 7, offered by the gentleman from California, the ranking member, Mr. DELLUMS, on the B-2 bomber; amendment No. 8, offered by Mr. BUYER; and No. 9, offered by Mr. HILLEARY, on Bosnia. And under the rule these 20-minute amendments would be preceded by 1 hour of general debate, and the amendment made in order yesterday in the amended rule offered by Mr. EVERETT on depot policy and any remaining part 2 amendments, either in an en bloc package or consideration individually, as 10-minute amendments under the rule.

So it is his desire to dispose of all amendments on Monday evening so that we can finish consideration of the bill sometime in the Tuesday morning timeframe.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I am very sorry that most of our colleagues have probably left for

NOES—119

Allen
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Brown (FL)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Conyers
Coyne
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Ehrlich
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez

Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Klecza
Kolbe
Lampson
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lofgren
Markley
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)

Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oliver
Ortiz
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stump
Stupak
Thompson
Tierney
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weygand
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—45

Ackerman
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bliley
Boehner
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Callahan
Canady
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Coburn
Cooksey

DeGette
Deutsch
Doolittle
Ehlers
Ewing
Ganske
Gephardt
Gillmor
Goss
Johnson, Sam
Largent
Lipinski
McCrary
McIntosh
Miller (CA)

Nethercutt
Oberstar
Pombo
Pomeroy
Rahall
Schiff
Stark
Stokes
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Torres
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wise
Yates

□ 1351

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McIntosh for, with Mr. Stark against.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, I was not present to record votes on

their weekend schedules in their various districts, but I must make this observation, that I cannot remember a Monday night in this session that we have worked, and if we have, not a bill of this extraordinary magnitude.

The gentleman has laid out a number of significant and important, often contentious, difficult issues that we must deal with. This gentleman will be here prepared to do a job; that is what I have to do. But I want to say on behalf of myself and other Members that the fact that we are now suddenly finding ourselves in such a constrained schedule, that we have to push all of these issues into a Monday night I think flies in the face of what I think is reasonableness.

Now, I understand that there may be some time left over on Tuesday, but we now rush to judgment on a whole range of issues. I just want to make the observation, Mr. Chairman, and to my colleague, that I am not comfortable with the way this is proceeding. I have said at the outset, I do not like the rush to judgment on a \$263 billion budget, and now we are constrained into one day. When we went before the Committee on Rules, they said Thursday, Friday, Monday and Tuesday, try to finish this bill up on Tuesday. Now maybe there is an hour or two on Tuesday. We are forced to deal with a myriad of incredible issues.

Now, the reality is that 300 or 400 of our colleagues are already gone, heading home; many of them are going to fly back in here to be back on the floor at 5 o'clock. They are not going to know what we are debating. Many of them will be tired from the weekend and tired from their flights, and we are going to get into issues like the B-2 bomber, like Bosnia, like the whole range of critical questions that are very contentious and important here.

I think we ought to be at our best when we are dealing with these issues, not when we are tired and not when we are making votes based on our ignorance by not being here. I just want to make that statement. I am not running the show here, those folks are, but I just want my colleagues to know from this side of the aisle that I am very uncomfortable with the way this process is going. It is the first Monday that we are dealing with this level of significance, and I would like for my colleague to at least respond in some manner to that concern.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. Let me just say personally, as the gentleman who has engaged the gentleman in these major arms control issues and the B-2 bomber issue for a number of years, I too look forward to a robust debate on the B-2 bomber, and I think it is our duty to force as many colleagues as we can to listen to us one more time on that issue, and I think we will be able to do that.

I understand that the reason that we are trying to keep this thing out of Tuesday's schedule as much as pos-

sible, that the chairman has that desire; it is because we have got another issue coming up that is supposed to be engaged on Tuesday. So we may be bumping up against the schedule.

I want to assure my colleague that it is my desire to have a robust debate, especially on the B-2 issue, and I know the depot issue is one that has a lot of claimants and will have a great deal of debate offered, and the chairman of the full committee is a very gracious individual, and I am sure if the gentleman talks to him, if we can get an extra hour or two on Tuesday morning from the leadership and maybe push that other issue up a little bit, we can have a more robust debate on B-2, Bosnia and the depot issue.

So the gentleman has got my assurance that I will sit with him and the chairman, and my desire is to have as big a debate and as full a debate as possible.

So that is what I would offer to the gentleman, but I understand that the chairman of the full committee had the problem of bumping up against the next bill, and that is why he is trying to get our amendments finished and get the bill finished by Tuesday morning.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman will yield, I appreciate his response. I understand that this committee is operating within the framework of a much larger structure. I just felt compelled to make that observation. I think that disadvantages a number of Members on both sides of the aisle, but that is just my observation, and leadership going to have to make the judgment that they choose to make. Unfortunately, we will of to live with them, but I do not think that they are good judgments.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1400

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CALVERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 1119.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the House schedule, I would like to have everyone's attention for a very important announcement.

My son and my lovely daughter-in-law last night graced me with a new little fishing buddy. David and Laurie Armeay became the proud parents of a beautiful baby boy, as yet without a name, my first grandson, my first grandchild. And even though I am not a registered lobbyist, I would like to make a pitch to the new parents. Richard, a great name, a name of kings, presidents, race car drivers and country music singers. I would hope that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader, would join me in this lobbying effort to add one more Richard to this world.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, I would certainly like to indicate I will intercede with him, and the gentleman from Texas has my commitment to help him in the lobbying for another little Richard.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for his timely reminder of even one more classification, pop singers named Richard as well as country singers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can return to less important matters, the business of this House, we have finished the last vote for the week. We will meet for legislative business on Monday, June 23; let me reiterate, we will meet for legislative business on Monday, June 23. We will start morning hour at 10:30 a.m. and consideration of legislation will commence at 12 noon.

Members should note that we will not hold any recorded votes before 5 p.m. on Monday. On Monday, June 23, we plan to take up a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices this afternoon. The House will then resume consideration of H.R. 1119, the National Defense Authorization Act, for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. We expect to work well into the evening on Monday, probably until 10 or 11 p.m., on DOD amendments.

On Tuesday, June 24, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour and 10 a.m. for legislative business. We will take up the following bills: H.R. 1316, the Federal Fishery Clarification Act on the Corrections Day Calendar;