

is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 562 and that I be allowed to include a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2016, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.RES. 228

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 228 waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The conference report for H.R. 2016, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998, shall be considered as read. The House rules provide for 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report appropriates a total of \$9.2 billion, which is \$600 million less than was appropriated last year. It is important to note, however, this amount is \$800 million more than the amount requested by the President.

We know that much of this Nation's military housing and on-base housing have deteriorated to substandard con-

ditions, unsuitable for the men and women who serve our Nation. While our Armed Forces deserve the very best we can provide, the current facilities assure that we will not be able to retain the best and brightest in our military.

□ 1415

This bill addresses the need to improve the quality of life of our military and their families.

Specifically, the bill provides \$3.9 billion for family housing, including funding for new housing and improvements. Regarding improvements in the quality of life that I mentioned earlier, H.R. 2016 provides \$32 million for child development centers, \$163 million for medical facilities, and \$3 billion for the operation and maintenance of existing family housing units.

It is also important to note that the conference report appropriates \$857 million for environmental cleanup and \$104 million for environmental compliance.

I hope that we can pass this bill quickly so that there is no delay in cleaning up contaminated sites on our military bases.

This bill achieves our goal of spending taxpayer money more efficiently and where it is needed most. Notwithstanding the constraints we now face after decades of fiscal irresponsibility, H.R. 2016 effectively funds programs that will provide child day care centers and improved hospital facilities. These appropriations guarantee the health and safety of the families and children of our service men and women.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking minority member, for their continued bipartisanship. These two men and their committee understand that this is an important bill for the men and women who defend our country.

I urge the House to pass this rule without delay so that we may proceed with the consideration of a conference report that will improve the quality of life, housing, and medical services of our Armed Forces, their families and their children.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and this conference report providing appropriations for military construction in fiscal year 1998. This conference report rightfully retains the emphasis the House-passed bill placed on quality-of-life issues for the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families, and deserves the support of all of the Members of this body.

Forty-two percent of the funds in this conference agreement are dedicated to family housing, including \$900 million for new family housing units and for improvements to existing units

and \$3 billion for the operation and maintenance of existing units. Decent housing for our troops and their families should be one of the highest priorities, and this bill makes a significant continued commitment toward improving the housing available on our military installations around the world.

But improvements are not just for family housing, Mr. Speaker. This conference agreement also provides \$724 million for barracks for single and unaccompanied military personnel. This conference report also includes \$32 million for child development centers and \$160 million for hospital and medical facilities on military installations.

In combination, these items total more than half of the \$9.2 billion recommended in this conference report, amply demonstrating the commitment of this conference on a bipartisan basis to improving the standard of living of the men and women we depend upon to protect and defend our Nation. It is the very least we can do, and I commend this conference report to my colleagues.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at the time that the previous question is put I will ask for a vote on it, hoping to defeat the previous question so that we can make in order a resolution at the end of the resolution, adding a new section which would say that before the House adjourns sine die for the first session of this Congress it shall consider campaign finance reform legislation under an open amendment process.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the purpose of this is to try once again to get the House to consider the important issue of campaign finance reform. We have seen, we have just come through an historic election in this country where hundreds of millions of dollars were raised and spent on behalf of various campaigns, and what we are witnessing now, both in the Senate and soon in the House, are investigations into how that money was spent by both the national committees and the administration and congressional campaign committees.

However, what has become very, very clear in that situation is that there is a dramatic need to overhaul our campaign finance system in this country. Money is now flowing into campaigns that overwhelms all of the limits that originally were placed on Federal campaigns in terms of what individual candidates can take, what individuals can contribute, what organizations, political action committees can contribute. We now see that those reforms are being overwhelmed by the huge influx of soft money into these campaigns.

I personally believe that we should have a ban on soft money, but more important than my personal belief is whether or not this House will schedule campaign finance reform for an open debate on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Last week, the American public witnessed the dictatorial activities of a senior Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee barring a hearing, a simple hearing, as to the fitness of a candidate for Ambassador to Mexico. Democracy seems to have been thrown out of the window here in terms of how these two bodies are now proceeding.

We now see that clearly a majority of Members of the House support some kind of campaign finance reform in one fashion or another, but we are not allowed to debate it. We are not allowed to debate it because a handful of people in the leadership have decided that it will not come to the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair whether it is within the Rules of the House to refer to Members in the other body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not within the rules, and the Chair would advise the Member not to refer to individual Members from the other body.

The gentleman from California may proceed in order.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair explain to me how one talks about the other body, then?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One refers to it as the other body, and one may not be critical of individual Senators.

Mr. MILLER of California. So some Member in the other body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed in order.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would be happy to. It is just an interesting notion of free speech.

I would have to say again that some Member in the other body, apparently a single Member in the other body which I cannot identify, but the other body, acted in such a fashion that one cannot get a hearing on the Presidential nomination for Ambassador to Mexico. Those of my colleagues who are familiar with encryption can figure out what I said. Those of my colleagues who are not can read the morning paper and find out what took place.

But the fact of the matter is in this body we see the same kinds of activities to deny a majority in this House a debate and a discussion and a vote on campaign finance reform, and that is tragic. That is tragic because what we see is the infusion of money. The infusion of money, much of the money that cannot be tracked, cannot be traced, nobody takes credit for it, and yet it shows up in campaigns on behalf of one

interest versus another, apparently completely unregulated by the campaign laws of this Nation, is influencing how we are making decisions. It is corroding the democratic process. It is corroding the democratic process in this House, and it is corroding the democratic process in the Senate. The time has come to give the people an opportunity to see where we stand on campaign finance reform.

This is not a liberal or conservative issue. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue, although it is the Republican leadership that is currently blocking this. We just noticed this week in one of the more conservative magazines in this country that campaign finance reform has become one of the top issues among conservative constituencies, about whether Republicans will have campaign finance reform or they will not. It has jumped from being of little notice by the American people to now in the double digits of what they consider to be the most important issue confronting this country.

Why is it the most important issue? Because whether we are doing military construction or whether we are doing a tax bill or a commerce bill or whatever it is, what we see now is the special interest influence on the outcome of these debates is disproportionate to that of the average American, and it is disproportionate for one reason. It is disproportionate because of money.

That we are influenced no longer is just the fact that Congressman so-and-so represents us and we can pick up the phone and say "I am an interested citizen in your district." What we now see is too often that phone call is delayed while we talk to people who give tens of thousands of dollars, hundreds of thousands of dollars, and most recently now million dollar contributions.

We now see it is the tobacco companies. We can talk all we want about tobacco while we were doing the tax bill, but it was not in there. And then late one night, the last night of the session, in the dark of night a \$50 billion provision got put in that bill because of soft money and special interest money, not because of the American people.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that the single largest special interest in the last election were the labor unions which spent, according to a Rutgers University study, between \$300 and \$500 million in campaigns, 100 percent of it against Republicans, and of the 84 or 85 proposals being proposed or offered as bills, not a single one from the Democrat side proposes dealing with that expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the Chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia [Mr. LINDER], a member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the membership that we are de-

bating a rule which waives points of order against the conference report on the military construction appropriation bill. One would not believe that from what I heard when I was sitting up in my office a few minutes ago. Members should generally follow the Rules of the House around here and address themselves to the questions under debate. However, the issue that has been raised by some on the other side of the aisle is of great concern to me, and I really feel compelled to respond to it.

Today, many Members in the minority are advocating that the House should consider some form of campaign finance reform. Well, Mr. Speaker, according to the Congressional Research Service, there are approximately 85 campaign finance reform bills pending before this Congress right now. There are proposals from liberals, there are proposals from conservatives and Republicans and Democrats which approach this issue from differing philosophical perspectives.

But before any legislative body can make laws, it must first assess the functioning of the existing laws. The enforcement of existing law, Mr. Speaker, has experienced an absolute meltdown here in Washington. It is unbelievable to the American public.

When I talk to my constituents in upstate New York, I hear less interest in how political campaigns are financed and more interest in whether public officials in the Clinton White House will obey the law. That is what they were telling me this past weekend when I was home.

Mr. Speaker, the revelations of wrongdoing at the highest levels of the Clinton administration appear in this Nation's newspapers and magazines every single day, not just in conservative publications, but the New York Times just over the weekend calling for an independent counsel to be appointed, and yet nothing is being done by this Attorney General.

The fund-raising scandal of the Clinton administration which continues to unfold on a daily basis raises grave questions about economic espionage that every Member of this body ought to be concerned about. Economic espionage means the loss of American jobs and the extent to which American foreign policy was compromised by influence from a foreign power. Does that not bother my colleagues on the other side of the aisle? I am going to tell my colleagues something, it bothers me as a U.S. citizen.

Was American national security compromised by campaign contributions from abroad, Mr. Speaker? The newspaper editorials across this country say it was, and they call for an independent counsel. Did officials at the highest levels of the Clinton administration break the law in their zeal to raise funds for the President's reelection? Mr. Speaker, these are the profound issues which must be addressed by the investigative functions of this Congress

before we can adequately reshape campaign finance laws, if we need to do it at all.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my friends on the other side to focus their attention on these congressional investigations which are ongoing, rather than call the House into consideration of a nefarious campaign finance reform bill. My constituents are not asking for a vague financing reform proposal, but rather that the occupants of the White House today simply respect their office, and especially the Cabinet level members of the White House, respect their office and obey the laws of the land and carry out their obligations. That is what we ought to be debating on this floor today. That is what the people back home want to know about, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1430

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY].

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to talk about the fact that underlying all of the expenditures and the considerations for expenditures is the issue of how we do our business, and whether or not we do it in a credible fashion.

I take some issue with the previous speaker indicating that the voters in his district perhaps are not interested in having us debate campaign finance reform, and instead want to know more what is happening in the investigatory sense.

We have two committees, one in the House and one in the Senate, that are supposedly investigating past practices. Unfortunately, the one in the House is spending a lot of time doing depositions that, I might add, seem to be unfocused, accomplishing very little; in fact, I understand again today have postponed certain hearings with regard to that.

But people in the country are worried about what we are going to do about future practices. They are worried about both parties and the way their fund-raising enterprises have been conducted, and whether or not the perception is that there is any honesty in government, and whether or not the actions we take are credible. There is a perception that the amount of money that is injected into politics at all levels, but particularly the national level, have a bad effect, an ill effect, on our governing.

The fact of the matter is that once again it seems that States and cities are taking the lead in a lot of what should be national or Federal policy initiatives. They are driving national policy.

When it comes to talking about sanctions for South Africa, or it comes to talking about what is going on in Burma, it has been States and local communities that have taken the lead in trying to make sure that something happens there. When it comes to talking about minimum wages, it is the

States and local communities that have taken the risk of raising the minimum wage for workers in their communities.

The fact of the matter is that a number of States have moved forward on campaign finance reform. In Vermont we saw the legislature there pass a campaign finance reform initiative. In the State of Maine people went to the ballot and by almost 60 percent got behind a campaign finance reform initiative. In Ohio there has been a cutback in the large contributions and stiffened disclosure rules; in New Hampshire, stiffer disclosure rules; in New York, computerized disclosure rules.

In State after State, in Oregon and Idaho, New Mexico, Georgia, North Carolina, citizens' groups have gone to the fore and led the charge. We should not have to stay here in Congress and wait once again for local citizen groups, local communities, and States to lead the charge on what is, in fact, a national issue of importance to people. As well as knowing what might have gone wrong in the past, they insist that this body look forward to see what we are going to do with our own campaign finance practices.

At a bare minimum we ought to be looking at doing something about soft money. There are few, if any, people in the American public who doubt that that is at least one issue that we can resolve here and we can deal with in this session.

My suggestion is that if there are, in fact, 85 initiatives there, they ought to be assigned to committees, we ought to be debating those, we ought to be moving some of those to this floor, so the American people will not think that the only deliberative body in this entire country that seems unwilling to address the matter is the body that should be doing something first and foremost, this Congress.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to stand up and echo some comments that were said earlier about how important this military construction budget is, and how important it is that we do first things first and take care of the men and women who have been taking care of our country. I have toured bases across the country, and I have seen, unfortunately, that funding for quality of life issues is woefully inadequate.

I wish this entire debate could be concerned around that, because we could talk not only for an hour but we could talk for days about the importance of taking care of the men and women in uniform that protect and defend this country, and have done so honorably for some time.

Regrettably, the subject has been changed. It has been changed time and time again. Regrettably, some people may believe that there is a cynical rea-

son why the subject continues to be changed. It continues to be changed because those that claim to want to change the law cannot even follow the laws that are already in practice.

I saw this weekend an editorial from the New York Times that aimed directly at many of those who are now clamoring for campaign finance reform. It was in the Sunday editorial. This same Democratic Party who is now stepping forward, claiming that they are now interested in campaign finance reform, took several hits from the usually liberal editorial page of the New York Times.

The New York Times this weekend wrote of this newly reform-minded Democratic Party: "The Democratic Party has engaged in a systematic scheme of juggling its books, transferring money from one account to another, in possible violation of the law." The New York Times also wrote, " * * * the Democrats mixed campaign accounts that are supposed to be rigidly separate. * * * The first order of business ought to be fixing responsibility for the Democrats' fund-raising abuses * * * the shuffling of accounts * * * the laundering of money and illegal transfers of funds from foreign sources."

The New York Times went on to talk about this newly reform-minded Democratic Party by stating, "Last week we learned that the Democratic National Committee routinely deposited soft money in its hard money or candidate accounts without informing the donors * * * it is clear that the DNC was casual about one of the law's most basic distinctions."

They also wrote, "The torrent of disclosures of political fund-raising abuses by the Democrats last year has no doubt had a numbing effect on many Americans. But if ordinary citizens find it hard to keep track of the shady characters, the bank transfers, and memos suggesting that the administration and others knew what they say they did not know, the Justice Department has no excuse."

They conclude by saying that this Attorney General, who for many Democrats in the early 1970's must have been outraged by a lot of the conduct of former Attorney General John Mitchell, it says, "This Attorney General should step aside and let someone with a less partisan view of law enforcement take over the crucial task of investigating the White House money flow."

Yet we continue to hear these so-called calls for reform, when the New York Times itself is talking about money laundering and continued violations of Federal law that we already have in practice.

I have been hearing this now for some time. We have heard that there is a connection, an illegal connection possibly, between the unions, which gave \$300,000 to \$500,000, and the Democratic National Committee; from Communist China and the Democrat National Committee; and all of these other illegal or improper sources, and

yet we hear the Democrats coming to the floor talking about the need for campaign finance reform.

It makes me wonder what parallels could be drawn from, let us say, the driver of Princess Diana coming back from the dead to talk about the need of lowering speed limits in tunnels throughout Paris, or talking about the need to toughen drunk driver laws in Paris. These same people that have violated law after law after law now come to us and talk about the need for new laws. They could not abide by the old ones, so let us make them tougher.

Let us talk about a few of the laws we could worry about that fix up things through the rest of this year without going to a new set. The 2 U.S.C. 2441(e) prohibits foreign nationals from directly or through others contributing to any political campaign or soliciting, accepting, or receiving such contributions; in other words, no foreign money. Clearly this law has already been violated.

Then there is section 18 U.S.C. 1956, which prohibits the solicitation or acceptance of laundered campaign contributions intended to conceal the nature, source, ownership, or control of funds. This would apply, for instance, if you are going to, let us say, a Buddhist temple for a fund-raiser and accepting money from dirt-poor Buddhist nuns who have taken an oath of poverty who mysteriously came up with \$140,000.

This law, it appears apparent in most major news articles, has already been violated.

Then there is 18 U.S.C. 607, which prohibits the solicitation of campaign funds on Government property. Records show that in this administration a number of people have violated this law over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have time to do it right now, but we could go through law after law after law. It is certainly not my point to embarrass anybody that comes to this floor, and I will not do it by talking about the specifics of their campaign accounts, but I will say that one person who continually comes to this floor talking about the need to be able to trace campaign forms, and I do not speak today of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who did bring up this subject, but one person who continually comes to this floor, who comes to this floor talking about the need to be able to trace campaign accounts, received over \$590,000 in soft money contributions from union sources who used them in television ads that could not be traced through the Federal Elections Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this call for the changes in laws is nothing more than an attempt to change the subject. Instead of talking about changing the laws, let us just have the Democrats and the Democratic National Committee abide by the laws that are already passed.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the last speaker has made a bunch of interesting comments.

I would point out to him that the only Member of the House of Representatives who has pled guilty to campaign violations during this session of Congress was a Member on the other side of the aisle, a Republican Member from the State of California.

If he wants to make these kinds of allegations, he had best be careful when he is talking about Members of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. LINDER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, my point would be if that gentleman came to this floor talking about the need to clean up campaign finance, I would be the first one to come to this floor telling him that he is acting shamelessly, telling him to get off the floor of this House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

Mr. Speaker, we are having a little bit of an interesting dialog here on a topic that is important to many of the American people, which is the way we finance our campaigns here to get elected to the U.S. Congress, the Senate, and the Presidency. I think there is room for bipartisan agreement, which is that the current system stinks. It stinks. The influence of special interest money here in Washington, DC, is evident day in, day out.

Go back and page through the tax bill and wonder where some of those special provisions, the 73 special individual provisions in the tax bill which did not grant much tax relief to middle-American families, came from; very, very, very well-financed organizations that give tremendous amounts of money to people running for Federal office.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have a problem now. Now their own base, their own constituents, according to a recent poll in the Weekly Standard, a Republican conservative magazine, support by a large margin an overhaul of the way we finance campaigns in this country. So I can understand why the gentleman is defensive the other side of the aisle, why the gentleman wants to obfuscate the issue before us.

I am willing to admit there is a bipartisan problem. There is a problem both with the Democrats and with the Republicans here. I would like to remind the gentleman that it is Bob Dole's vice finance chairman who went to jail for 6 months, Simon Fireman, who pled guilty to 74 counts of money laundering.

Yes, we have some laws, and occasionally someone gets convicted, but the laws are full of loopholes. There are a lot of other people doing things that average Americans think they should go to jail for that are actually legal under these current loophole-ridden numbers.

I am a sponsor of a couple of campaign finance reform bills. I am not going to argue the merits of those bills today, but what I would like to do is see that we here in the U.S. Congress are given a couple of days or a week before we rush home to debate this vitally important issue.

What is wrong with debate? What is wrong with airing these issues? What is wrong with bringing a few bills to the floor in an open amendment process? We have been working on the Health and Human Services bill for 7 days now, interminably, with an open rule. Let us bring campaign finance reform to the floor with an open rule. The chairman of the Committee on Rules promised us we would do almost everything in this Congress under an open rule.

Let us bring something that is so vitally important, that goes so much to the heart of our democracy, here to this floor. Let us have a promise that we will have that debate. Let us have a campaign finance reform week before we leave.

In light of that, we are asking our colleagues to vote no on the previous question to demonstrate their support for bringing this issue up before Congress rushes back for the cover of their home districts.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. Sadly, we got a bit off track on what we are supposed to be discussing. I would concur with the gentleman from Florida's comments who said that we cannot talk about our men and women in the armed services and the wonderful contributions they make to this country.

Mr. Speaker, as I go home each weekend, I meet with constituents, and I talk on talk shows, and I do town hall meetings. The one thing that clearly is communicated to me time and time again is the fact that this body is not very well respected. In fact, some might even say this body is hated and despised. I think it is because hypocrisy flows down the aisles of this body. I think time and time again there are those that speak out of both sides of their mouths.

I am not saying there is a corner on that market with either party, but I have to say that the hypocrisy that I am hearing ring so loudly from the other side is very, very confusing and disheartening.

□ 1445

In fact, what they do rings so loudly in my ears I cannot hear what they say. In the past there have been TV evangelists who stand up, bully thump on the podium and talk about the ravages and the wrongs associated with immorality and extramarital affairs, and then these same TV evangelists, they patrol the streets looking for ladies of the evening to satisfy their desires, and then they wonder aloud why

people have lost confidence in them. And we see the exact same thing happening in this body when we see flagrant violation after violation after violation.

And then we have folks on the other side that are trying to play the old bait and switch trick, trying to take the attention from the one nut with the pea under it so that they can pull the old trick on us. Well, let us get down to business and let us make sure that we honor the laws that we have on the books.

I wish that the last speaker was just as passionate in calling for the Attorney General to call on a special counsel so that we can get to the bottom of whether or not existing laws have been violated. Again, what they do rings so loudly in my ears I cannot hear what they say.

The New York Times editorial says Democrats skim \$2 million to aid candidates, records show. Why is it that we are not getting that kind of information from the Justice Department? Why is it that we have to rely on the media? Why have we not got special counsel right now? The fact is the Democrats' call for bans on soft money are blatantly hypocritical. While the Democrats cry wolf, the President is soliciting soft contributions of \$250,000 a pop from these fund-raisers that he is having.

The Democrats' strategy is simple. Again, it is bait and switch. They are trying to change the subject from illegal fund-raising phone calls of a high ranking official in the White House; from that same official shaking down Buddhist monks. It is time to get with the program. It is time we should understand exactly how existing laws were violated before we cry out for a new law. We have to know all the facts before we move forward.

Should we hold those responsible for violating current campaign finance laws and make them accountable for their actions? Otherwise, if we are going to pass a new law and implement that law with a wink and a nod, as we are doing with existing laws, if we do not have then an Attorney General who has the guts and the decency to investigate current laws, why do we want to add more laws to the books?

It is irresponsible to blame the system for the mess that they are in. It was deliberate unlawful acts, not the system, that caused them to violate the campaign finance laws that existed in the last election. Their calls for new campaign laws are an attempt again to bait and switch.

We want to get the truth out. We all do. Let us work hard to do it, and work hard in a bipartisan way, but let us stop the hypocrisy and walk the walk as well as talking the talk and knock off the hypocritical bait and switch routine that is going on over there.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I can understand the protest

from the other side. If I was stonewalling this as hard as they are, I would raise the objections, too.

The fact of the matter is the record is clear that when the Democrats were in control of Congress in the 102d Congress, 1991-92, we passed campaign finance reform and it was vetoed by George Bush. In 1993 and 1994 the Democratic controlled House and Senate again passed comprehensive campaign finance reform, but MITCH MCCONNELL filibustered the final bill on a motion to appoint the conferees.

With the Republican control now in 1995 and 1996, nothing from the Republican Congress; and now in the 105th Congress, nothing from the Republican Congress except a stonewall of the efforts. Our record is clear. When we controlled the House, this debate was brought to the floor of the House and the House worked its will, the Senate worked its will and, unfortunately, President Bush vetoed that legislation.

So I can understand why my Republican colleagues are flailing their arms over there, but the fact of the matter is they are what stands between the American people and the cleaning up of this unacceptable campaign finance system that we currently have.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I wish to remind the body that this rule is for a bill that my colleague and I, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], have put together and has been through conference, and we would like to remind the body that that is what this debate is supposed to be about.

We have a good rule. I support the rule. I hope that the body will vote for the rule and that the debate that has now been going on, on campaign finance reform, will not divert our attention away from this very good rule.

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

First of all, let me say that I support the rule. This is a reasonable rule, as I stated earlier in my remarks. As the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has indicated, it is his intention to oppose the previous question in order to make an amendment which would require the House to consider campaign finance legislation before we adjourn sine die for the first session of this Congress.

The request being made by the gentleman from California that we consider campaign legislation sometime between now and the end of October is a reasonable request. There are a number of proposals pending which would do a variety of things, and I do not agree with all of the things that are under consideration, and I would like to take a moment to discuss some aspects of that.

That does not mean that we should not consider campaign finance reform, but it does mean that there are some

aspects of campaign finance reform that require careful consideration. One is the effort to totally ban donations of non-Federal money, commonly called soft money, to political parties.

Such a ban would have the ultimate effect of destroying the political party system in this country. Mr. Speaker, the destruction of organized political parties does not serve the ends of democracy, and will certainly never ensure the free and open political discourse so many people seek.

Let me be specific. Under this proposal to totally ban soft money, all elections in even numbered years anywhere in this country would essentially be federalized; that is, all activities conducted by State and local political parties would have to be paid for entirely out of federally qualified funds, since the names of Federal candidates appear on the ballot in those years. State and local political parties would be precluded from using funds that are otherwise legal under State law during election years when Federal election contests take place.

Let me take this one step further. If the total ban on soft money were to become law, State and local political parties could not use any locally used funds for such activities as voter registration, slate cards that contain the names of Federal candidates, get-out-the-vote phone banks designed to identify and turn out voters for an entire party ticket, or even programs designed to assist seniors in voting absentee by mail. These activities are of course conducted by State and local parties, which depend upon a combination of non-Federal donations and hard dollars for the funds necessary to carry them out.

Mr. Speaker, since federally qualifying dollars are tightly limited and controlled, and go primarily to candidates for the purchase of television and other advertising, State and local parties and the State and local candidates they support would have great difficulty operating under such a proposal.

There is no question that there have been abuses in the way soft money has been raised and the way soft money has been spent, and I agree, Mr. Speaker, that those abuses should be addressed by the Congress and should be addressed this year. The appropriate way to address these abuses is not to ban soft money, but rather to place reasonable caps on how much any individual or other entity, such as a corporation or union, can contribute to a party committee while allowing political parties to continue to pay for basic turnout activities with a combination of hard and soft dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I for one believe that vibrant, healthy political parties are crucial for the effective functioning of democracy. I feel that the proposal supported by some to totally ban soft money would destroy the institutions that are basic to and necessary for the

continuation of a representative democratic government in this Nation. Political parties ensure democratic representation in all levels of government in our society, and without them I fear that ultimately only those individuals who have great personal wealth will have the means to run for political office.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], who has been very active in this area of campaign finance reform on a comprehensive basis for a sustained period of time.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a short history of campaign finance reform and make it part of the RECORD.

Basically, we have heard comments here today that we as legislators should not legislate; that all we ought to do is investigate, give up our role of making law even when we find things that are broke that need fixing. We would rather hear and smear than make things that are wrong right.

I want to just point out to this House that has certainly not been the history under previous leadership in this House. Whenever my party, the minority party now, has been in charge of this House, we have passed comprehensive campaign finance reform, and that comprehensive campaign finance reform has done one of the primary things that is needed in this country that everybody is talking about, and that is put a limit on what we can spend.

People will say that is unconstitutional, the courts have said. They have never said we could not, in a law, set up a system where candidates could voluntarily limit themselves, and that is the bill that is before this Congress. It was before the last Congress. And in fact in the last Congress it was the bill that got more votes than any other bill on campaign reform.

Unfortunately, this year, we have not even been able to have a hearing in the committee of authorization, much less set a schedule for when that bill will be brought to the floor and voted on.

The American public is sick and tired of seeing us just talk about campaign finance reform, just to investigate past campaigns, they want us to use our role as legislators. The courts cannot do that. The administration cannot do that. When things are broken in the law, the only people that can fix it are the people that are serving in this House. And in fact we can fix it for our House without even fixing it for the Senate. We can have a different set of rules in running for the U.S. Congress.

And we ought to be doing that but, instead, we are trying to backpedal, we are trying to find excuses, we want to have more hearings, we want to discuss it. Well, the history shows that this House has never done that before. We have never waited so long to do so little about campaign reform as we are doing in this session.

In the 1989-90, the 101st Congress, a bill was passed then by Tony Coelho,

and it had cosponsors on the other side. It went through the hearings, was adopted and passed the House on August 3, 1990, by a vote of 255. Obviously, it could not have been done just on a pure partisan vote. Bipartisan vote on a comprehensive campaign reform, that same bill, is sitting before the House today, an approved version of that bill H.R. 600.

In the 102d Congress the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] introduced a bill. It had key sponsors from both sides of the aisle. It went through a hearing process and passed the House on November 25.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit the remainder of my remarks for the RECORD. Since I am out of time.

A SHORT HISTORY OF CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

100TH CONGRESS, 1987-88

House

H.R. 2717: Introduced June 18, 1987 by Tony Coelho (D-CA).

Key Cosponsors: Leach, Synar; 96 cosponsors in all.

Legislative action: Went through the hearing process but was never reported from committee (never went to the floor).

Senate

S. 2: Introduced January, 1987 by David Boren (D-OK).

Legislative action: Then-Majority Leader Bob Byrd tried to bring the bill to the floor for a vote. The Republicans filibustered the consideration of the bill for a record seven cloture votes.

101ST CONGRESS, 1989-90

House

H.R. 14: Introduced January 3, 1989 by Tony Coelho (D-CA).

Key Cosponsors: Leach, Synar; 98 cosponsors in all.

Legislative action: No action taken on this bill; for further action, see H.R. 5400.

H.R. 5400: Introduced July 30, 1990 by Al Swift (D-WA).

Key Cosponsors: Gephardt, Gray, Brooks, Annunzio, McHugh, Anthony, Frost, Sabo, Synar; 9 cosponsors in all.

Legislative action: Went through the hearing process. Passed the House August 3, 1990 by a vote of 255-155 (including 15 Republicans voting yes). Was adopted in the Senate on September 18, 1990.

Senate

S. 137: Introduced January 25, 1989 by David Boren (D-OK).

Legislative action: Went through the hearing process. Passed the Senate on September 18, 1990 (H.R. 5400 in lieu) by voice vote.

Conferees were never appointed to reconcile the two versions of the bill. Congress adjourned October 28, 1990.

102D CONGRESS, 1991-92

House

H.R. 3750: Introduced November 21, 1991 by Sam Gejdenson (D-CT).

Key Cosponsors: Gephardt, Bonior, Derrick, Kennelly, Lewis (GA), Hoyer, Fazio; 82 cosponsors in all.

Legislative action: Went through the hearing process. Passed the House November 25, 1991 by a vote of 273-156.

Senate

S. 3: Introduced January 14, 1991 by David Boren (D-OK).

Legislative action: Went through the hearing process. Passed the Senate May 23, 1991 by a vote of 56-42 (H.R. 3750 in lieu).

Conferees were appointed in March, 1992.

House agreed to the conference report on April 9, 1992 by a vote of 259-165.

Senate agreed to the conference report on April 30, 1992 by a vote of 58-42.

President Bush vetoed the bill May 5, 1992.

Senate failed to override the veto May 13, 1992 by a vote of 57-42.

103D CONGRESS, 1993-94

House

H.R. 3: Introduced January 5, 1993 by Sam Gejdenson (D-CT).

Key Cosponsors: Gephardt, Bonior, Derrick, Kennelly, Lewis (GA), Hoyer, Fazio; 45 cosponsors in all.

Legislative action: Passed the House November 22, 1993 by a vote of 255-175 (S. 3 in lieu); requested conference with the Senate the same day.

Senate

S. 3: Introduced January 21, 1993 by David Boren (D-OK).

Legislative action: Passed the Senate June 17, 1993 by a vote of 60-38. Cloture filed on motion to go to conference on September 23, 1994 due to filibuster by Senator Phil Gramm (R-TX); cloture failed on September 27. Second cloture petition filed on September 28; failed on September 30.

Congress adjourned sine die on October 8, 1994.

104TH CONGRESS, 1995-96

House

H.R. 3505: Introduced May 22, 1996 by Sam Farr (D-CA).

Key Cosponsors: Gephardt, Bonior, Fazio, DeLauro, Lewis (GA), Richardson, Kennelly; 88 cosponsors in all.

Legislative action: Went through the hearing process; was offered as a substitute to the Republican campaign finance reform bill in committee and on the floor. Failed passage on the floor 177-243. Received bipartisan support.

Senate

S. 1219: Introduced September 2, 1995 by John McCain (R-AZ).

Legislative action: Went through hearing process; cloture filed, failed by a vote of 54-46 on June 25, 1996.

Office of Rep. Sam Farr,

September 9, 1997.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here ignoring the purpose of this rule, military construction, and debating campaign finance. It should be pointed out that we are in this fix because the Democrats passed comprehensive reform in 1975, after Watergate, and the adherence to the rules they cannot abide by, and now they want to fix it.

The previous speaker said his party has passed comprehensive reform on many occasions since 1989. They have, reform that they are very happy with because it does not deal with off-record spending by labor unions, the Sierra Club, Ralph Nader, but only those monies raised and spent by candidates. The gentleman from California only deals with soft money. He does not care about all the rest of it, he has to fix soft money.

The fact of the matter is we have good laws on the books that have been broken, and rather than admit that the laws that they broke should put people in trouble with the Justice Department, they want to change the system.

This is not new. I have raised two kids through their adolescent and teenage years who are now adults. I have seen people get caught, young children get caught with their hand in the cookie jar and blame the cookie jar. This is blame the system and change the subject.

I have not heard much lately from the Vice President regarding campaign reform. That is perhaps because he has so abused the laws currently on the books. We now see, according to Time Magazine, that his former chief adviser, Mr. Peter Knight, is under investigation by the Justice Department because of his multilayered connections to a Massachusetts manufacturer. They won \$33 million in Federal contracts and regulatory breaks from this administration, while the firm and its officers raised or gave a total of \$132,000 for the President and his party in the last election.

□ 1500

It goes on to say that Mr. Knight is the epitome of a new generation of money men in both parties whose works does not end with the election, it really just begins. This is the influence peddling. It has nothing to do with money raised or spent legally by Members of Congress or the Senate for election. This is influence peddling, and there are laws on the books currently against that.

It was brought up earlier that the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] has admitted to raising illegal foreign contributions and is accepting his punishment. It was further brought up that a gentleman raised money for Senator Bob Dole's presidential campaign and spent time in jail. Both are true.

The Justice Department worked fast, swift, and sure against Republicans. But what has it done against Charlie Trie or John Huang or the lady from Thailand, whose last name escapes me? It has not even begun hearing them. The gentleman who helped Senator Bob Dole's Presidential campaign was in jail before. John Huang has not even been questioned.

If the Justice Department worked as meticulously and as quick in the questions of Democratic abuse as it does Republican abuse, we would not be having this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by reminding my colleagues that defeating the previous question is an exercise in futility because the minority wants to offer an amendment that will be ruled out of order as non-germane to this rule. So the vote is without substance. The previous question vote itself is simply a procedural motion to close debate on this rule and proceed to vote on its adoption. The vote has no substantive or policy implication whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert an explanation to the previous question.

[From the House Rules Committee]
THE PREVIOUS QUESTION VOTE: WHAT IT MEANS

The previous question is a motion made in order under House Rule XVII and is the only parliamentary device in the House used for closing debate and preventing amendment. The effect of adopting the previous question is to bring the resolution to an immediate, final vote. The motion is most often made at the conclusion of debate on a rule or any motion or piece of legislation considered in the House prior to final passage. A Member might think about ordering the previous question in terms of answering the question: Is the House ready to vote on the bill or amendment before it?

In order to amend a rule (other than by using those procedures previously mentioned), the House must vote against ordering the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, the House is in effect, turning control of the Floor over to the Minority party.

If the previous question is defeated, the Speaker then recognizes the Member who led the opposition to the previous question (usually a Member of the Minority party) to control an additional hour of debate during which a germane amendment may be offered to the rule. The Member controlling the Floor then moves the previous question on the amendment and the rule. If the previous question is ordered, the next vote occurs on the amendment followed by a vote on the rule as amended.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 238, nays 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

YEAS—238

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert

Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot

Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey

Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly

Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Markey
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalfe
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula

NAYS—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio

DeGette
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley

Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traffant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)

McDermott	Peterson (MN)	Snyder
McGovern	Pickett	Spratt
McHale	Pomeroy	Stabenow
McKinney	Poshard	Stark
McNulty	Price (NC)	Stokes
Meehan	Rahall	Strickland
Meek	Rangel	Stupak
Menendez	Reyes	Tanner
Millender-	Rivers	Tauscher
McDonald	Rodriguez	Thompson
Miller (CA)	Roemer	Thurman
Minge	Rothman	Tierney
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Moakley	Rush	Towns
Mollohan	Sabo	Turner
Moran (VA)	Sanchez	Velazquez
Nadler	Sanders	Vento
Neal	Sandlin	Visclosky
Oberstar	Sawyer	Waters
Obey	Schumer	Watt (NC)
Olver	Scott	Waxman
Ortiz	Serrano	Wexler
Owens	Sherman	Weygand
Pallone	Sisisky	Wise
Pascrell	Skaggs	Woolsey
Pastor	Skelton	Wynn
Payne	Slaughter	Yates
Pelosi	Smith, Adam	

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (FL)	Foglietta	Gonzalez
Evans	Furse	Schiff

□ 1532

Messrs. MARTINEZ, MORAN of Virginia, and BROWN of Ohio changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PAPPAS, SMITH of Oregon, SAXTON, and DOOLITTLE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD]. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 228, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 9, 1997, at page H7084.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to ac-

company H.R. 2016, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the conferees completed this agreement in a short 10 minutes with no disagreement. We have emphasized in this conference report family and unaccompanied housing, daycare centers, hospitals, and those quality of life issues that affect our men and women in the services.

There is no disagreement on the conference report. We feel it will move rather quickly without a great deal of discussion.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], my counterpart and former chairman of this subcommittee, for the remarkable work he has done in helping to bring this about, and to all members of the committee and subcommittee, both on the Democrat and Republican side. It has been a bipartisan effort to put this conference report together.

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2016)

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Military construction, Army.....	565,686,000	595,277,000	721,027,000	652,046,000	714,377,000	+ 148,689,000
Rescissions.....	-3,028,000					+ 3,028,000
Total, Military construction, Army (net)	562,660,000	595,277,000	721,027,000	652,046,000	714,377,000	+ 151,717,000
Military construction, Navy	707,094,000	540,106,000	685,306,000	605,756,000	683,666,000	-23,428,000
Rescissions.....	-19,780,000					+ 19,780,000
Total, Military construction, Navy (net).....	687,314,000	540,106,000	685,306,000	605,756,000	683,666,000	-3,648,000
Military construction, Air Force.....	754,064,000	495,782,000	662,305,000	662,305,000	701,855,000	-52,209,000
Rescissions.....	-5,100,000					+ 5,100,000
Total, Military construction, Air Force (net)	748,964,000	495,782,000	662,305,000	662,305,000	701,855,000	-47,109,000
Military construction, Defense-wide	763,922,000	673,633,000	613,333,000	690,889,000	646,342,000	-117,580,000
Rescissions.....	-51,000,000					+ 51,000,000
Total, Military construction, Defense-wide (net).....	712,922,000	673,633,000	613,333,000	690,889,000	646,342,000	-66,580,000
Total, Active components.....	2,711,880,000	2,304,798,000	2,681,971,000	2,610,996,000	2,746,240,000	+ 34,380,000
Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	78,086,000	45,098,000	45,098,000	234,614,000	118,350,000	+ 40,264,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	189,855,000	60,225,000	137,275,000	185,115,000	190,444,000	+ 589,000
Rescission	-5,000,000					+ 5,000,000
Total, Military construction, Air National Guard (net).....	184,855,000	60,225,000	137,275,000	185,115,000	190,444,000	+ 5,589,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	55,543,000	39,112,000	77,731,000	96,079,000	74,167,000	+ 18,624,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	37,579,000	13,921,000	40,561,000	21,111,000	47,329,000	+ 9,750,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	52,805,000	14,530,000	27,143,000	31,830,000	30,243,000	-22,562,000
Total, Reserve components.....	408,868,000	172,866,000	327,808,000	568,749,000	460,533,000	+ 51,665,000
Total, Military construction	3,125,728,000	2,477,684,000	3,009,779,000	3,179,745,000	3,206,773,000	+ 81,045,000
Appropriations.....	(3,209,836,000)	(2,477,684,000)	(3,009,779,000)	(3,179,745,000)	(3,206,773,000)	(-2,863,000)
Rescissions.....	(-83,908,000)					(+ 83,908,000)
NATO Security Investment Program.....	172,000,000	176,300,000	166,300,000	152,600,000	152,600,000	-19,400,000
Family housing, Army:						
Construction	158,503,000	143,000,000	202,131,000	167,100,000	197,300,000	+ 38,797,000
Operation and Maintenance	1,212,466,000	1,148,937,000	1,148,937,000	1,149,937,000	1,140,568,000	-71,898,000
Total, Family housing, Army	1,370,969,000	1,291,937,000	1,351,068,000	1,317,037,000	1,337,868,000	-33,101,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:						
Construction	499,886,000	278,933,000	409,178,000	362,619,000	393,832,000	-106,054,000
Operation and Maintenance	1,020,721,000	976,504,000	976,504,000	976,504,000	976,504,000	-44,217,000
Total, Family housing, Navy.....	1,520,607,000	1,255,437,000	1,385,682,000	1,339,123,000	1,370,336,000	-150,271,000
Family housing, Air Force:						
Construction	317,507,000	253,128,000	341,409,000	296,633,000	295,709,000	-21,798,000
Operation and Maintenance	816,509,000	830,234,000	830,234,000	830,234,000	830,234,000	+ 13,725,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force	1,134,016,000	1,083,362,000	1,171,643,000	1,126,867,000	1,125,943,000	-8,073,000
Family housing, Defense-wide:						
Construction	4,371,000	4,950,000	4,950,000	4,950,000	4,950,000	+ 579,000
Operation and Maintenance	30,963,000	32,724,000	32,724,000	32,724,000	32,724,000	+ 1,761,000
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide.....	35,334,000	37,674,000	37,674,000	37,674,000	37,674,000	+ 2,340,000
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund.....	25,000,000					-25,000,000
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	36,181,000					-36,181,000
Total, Family housing.....	4,122,107,000	3,668,410,000	3,946,067,000	3,820,701,000	3,871,821,000	-250,286,000
Construction.....	(980,267,000)	(680,011,000)	(957,668,000)	(831,302,000)	(891,791,000)	(-88,476,000)
Operation and Maintenance	(3,080,659,000)	(2,988,399,000)	(2,988,399,000)	(2,989,399,000)	(2,980,030,000)	(-100,629,000)
Family Housing Improvement Fund	(25,000,000)					(-25,000,000)
Homeowners Assistance Fund.....	(36,181,000)					(-36,181,000)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2016) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Base realignment and closure accounts:						
Part II.....	352,800,000	116,754,000	116,754,000	116,754,000	116,754,000	-236,046,000
Rescissions.....	-35,391,000					+35,391,000
Subtotal.....	317,409,000	116,754,000	116,754,000	116,754,000	116,754,000	-200,655,000
Part III.....	971,925,000	768,702,000	768,702,000	768,702,000	768,702,000	-203,223,000
Rescissions.....	-75,638,000					+75,638,000
Subtotal.....	896,287,000	768,702,000	768,702,000	768,702,000	768,702,000	-127,585,000
Part IV.....	1,182,749,000	1,175,398,000	1,175,398,000	1,175,398,000	1,175,398,000	-7,351,000
Rescissions.....	-22,971,000					+22,971,000
Subtotal.....	1,159,778,000	1,175,398,000	1,175,398,000	1,175,398,000	1,175,398,000	+15,620,000
Total, Base realignment & closure accounts (net).....	2,373,474,000	2,060,854,000	2,060,854,000	2,060,854,000	2,060,854,000	-312,620,000
Revised Economic Assumption (sec. 125).....				-31,000,000	-108,800,000	-108,800,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	9,793,309,000	8,383,248,000	9,183,000,000	9,182,900,000	9,183,248,000	-610,061,000
Appropriations.....	(10,011,217,000)	(8,383,248,000)	(9,183,000,000)	(9,182,900,000)	(9,183,248,000)	(-827,969,000)
Rescissions.....	(-217,908,000)					(+217,908,000)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to echo what my friend the gentleman from California [Chairman PACKARD] said, and also compliment the staff for an excellent job, as well as all the members on the committee.

This is a good bill. It goes toward the things we are so concerned about, the quality of life for our men and women in the Armed Forces. I would urge all Members to vote for this conference report, because it is not controversial and it is something that is good for our men and women in the service.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate conference committee report on H.R. 2016, Military Construction Appropriations for FY 1998, secures funding for the replacement of the fuel pipeline at Andersen Air Force Base on Guam. This is good news for the people of Guam.

Recent information relayed to my office indicated that funding for the pipeline relocation project was in danger of being withdrawn in favor of a Military Housing Project. The jet fuel pipes in question are currently installed above ground and are largely located outside Andersen Air Force Base. Had funding for the project been cut, the safety of the military and civilian population on Guam would have been threatened. In addition, leaving these pipes exposed would hinder economic development on Guam due to blockage of access areas. This is why I am greatly relieved that the conferees decided to restore funds for the pipeline project.

While, the pipeline relocation project is of prime importance to the people of Guam, however, I remain concerned that funds were restored at the expense of military housing improvements. I would like to assure everyone that the quality of life for our service members on Guam remains a priority and that I will continue to try securing funds for the project in the future.

In addition, I am happy to see that some \$80 million has been earmarked for barracks improvements in Korea. During my trip to Korea, I actually witnessed the dilapidated condition of their living facilities. The funds designated for this project will surely be welcomed and will improve the quality of life for our troops in Korea.

The Conference Committee also appropriated millions of dollars worth of add-ons for Guard and Reserve activities. However, none of the funds were made available to the Guam Army National Guard. I would like to call to everyone's attention that, due to lack of funding this year, the Guam Army National Guard continues to hold the distinction of being the only National Guard Unit that does not have an Armory. This is something that should be of concern to everyone and some thing that should be in everyone's agenda for the next fiscal year's appropriations.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the final conference version of the FY 1998 Military Construction Appropriations Bill, H.R. 2016, which passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 413 to 12 earlier today. As chairman of the House committee which crafted this legislation, I can attest to the bi-partisan, cooperative spirit in which we

have worked to bring this bill before Congress. My colleagues and I have worked to ensure that this legislation is both fiscally responsible and effective in addressing the needs of our armed services. The overwhelming support H.R. 2016 received today is clear proof of this legislation's merit.

The Military Construction Subcommittee appropriates funds for family housing, troop barracks, medical facilities and other items essential to the quality of life for our soldiers and their families. While the members of my Subcommittee are responsible for producing a bill that helps protect our national security, we are also compelled to honor a commitment to take care of those who guard our nation and protect freedom worldwide. Mr. Speaker, with the approval of this legislation today, Congress is sending the President a bill that accomplished nothing less.

I think most Americans would be shocked to see the finest trained and best equipped fighting force in the world coming home to leaky roofs, floors with holes and pipes that spew dirty water. Unfortunately, I have learned during my travel to defense installations both here and abroad that these unspeakable conditions are often a reality for the American soldier and his or her family. In fact, over sixty percent of all family housing in the military is unsuitable. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely unacceptable.

More than any other legislation we will consider this year, the Military Construction Appropriations bill has the most significant impact on those who serve our nation. This year, our bill directs nearly \$4 billion toward new family housing and improvements of existing facilities. We are providing \$32 million for new child development centers and \$163 million for hospital and medical facilities. We are also directing \$724 million for troop barracks that will directly benefit over 12,000 service members.

Mr. Speaker, if America wishes to remain the leader of the free world, we must take care of the men and women who protect our democratic ideals. I thank my colleagues for supporting this legislation and urge the president to sign it when it reaches his desk.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Pursuant to clause 7, rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 12, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger

Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono

Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas

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

Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascarelli
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin

Sanford	Snyder	Traficant
Sawyer	Solomon	Turner
Saxton	Souder	Velazquez
Scarborough	Spence	Vento
Schaefer, Dan	Spratt	Visclosky
Schaffer, Bob	Stabenow	Walsh
Schumer	Stearns	Wamp
Scott	Stenholm	Waters
Serrano	Stokes	Watkins
Sessions	Strickland	Watt (NC)
Shadegg	Stump	Watts (OK)
Shaw	Stupak	Waxman
Shays	Sununu	Weldon (FL)
Sherman	Talent	Weldon (PA)
Shimkus	Tanner	Weller
Shuster	Tauscher	Wexler
Siskis	Tauzin	Weygand
Skaggs	Taylor (MS)	White
Skeen	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Skelton	Thomas	Wicker
Slaughter	Thompson	Wise
Smith (MI)	Thune	Wolf
Smith (NJ)	Thurman	Woolsey
Smith (OR)	Tiahrt	Wynn
Smith, Adam	Tierney	Yates
Smith, Linda	Torres	Young (AK)
Snowbarger	Towns	Young (FL)

NAYS—12

Barrett (WI)	McCollum	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Minge	Stark
Cubin	Paul	Thornberry
Filner	Royce	Upton

NOT VOTING—8

Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	Nadler
Evans	Millender	Schiff
Furse	McDonald	Smith (TX)

□ 1600

Mr. MINGE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MENENDEZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 394 on H.R. 2016 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I the Journal stands approved.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. PELOSI moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2159, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related financing for the fiscal year 1998, be instructed to insist on the provision of the House bill with respect to providing \$650 million for the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund, including \$50 million for combatting infectious diseases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I have chosen to make the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund the subject of my motion to instruct on the foreign operations appropriations bill because of its vital importance and to reinforce a top priority of the House with respect to this bill.

The House, under the leadership of Chairman CALLAHAN, included \$650 million for the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund in order to emphasize that child survival and its programs to reduce infant mortality and to improve the health and nutrition of children in the poorest nations of the world should be our highest priority in our foreign assistance programs.

This year's bill contains an increase of \$50 million over the amounts provided last year specifically to combat infectious diseases around the world. These funds will add to the funds already planned to combat diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, polio, yellow fever, malaria, and measles. The Senate bill does not segregate these funds in a separate account, and provides for only \$30 million to combat infectious diseases.

The passage of this motion, which I am confident the Chairman will support, will strengthen the position of the House as we go into conference. I look forward to working with Chairman CALLAHAN in securing conference approval for this funding in a separate account, and at a full amount of \$650 million.

In addition, I look forward to working cooperatively with Chairman CALLAHAN, as we have so far, in achieving a conference agreement on foreign operations which funds all the programs in the bill at a level which will allow for sufficient resources to preserve the U.S. role of the world's only remaining superpower.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have received broad bipartisan support for the appropriations account I created several years ago for child survival and disease pro-

grams. This funding is intended to help protect the children of the world and to help stem the tide of infectious diseases that threaten both our children and ourselves.

We provided funding of \$600 million for these activities in fiscal year 1997. Although the administration proposed to slash these funds by \$44 million in 1998, we rejected that cut. In fact, we added \$50 million, for a total of \$650 million, to the child survival and disease programs fund, in order to focus on the growing problem of infectious diseases throughout the world.

Even before this year's initiative, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs launched an effort 3 years ago to wipe out polio throughout the world. We are providing \$25 million a year to assist Rotary International to fulfill its noble goal of eliminating this disease in Asia and Africa. That goal is within our grasp, and I am pleased that the subcommittee has been able to assist Rotary Clubs from around the Nation in this program.

But that is not enough. Tuberculosis continues to strike young people and children throughout the world. In fact, up to 30 million people may die from this disease in the next decade. In addition, health experts now realize that acute respiratory infections kill more children than any other disease. While these diseases are a threat to children everywhere, they are also a direct threat to the United States, due to the huge increase of international travel and migration in the last few years.

In addition, there have been confirmed reports of malaria and yellow fever in our own country. These diseases infected millions of Americans, and caused untold misery early in our history. We need to try to prevent outbreaks from these diseases from occurring again.

The committee has recommended an increase of \$50 million for activities to detect, control, and to prevent the spread of these and other communicable diseases. I regret that the administration does not consider child survival and disease programs to be a high priority. I am pleased that the Senate has turned its attention to this problem by providing an increase for infectious disease, but I am disappointed that they could not provide the protection of a separate appropriations account for child survival.

However, with the support of my good friend, the ranking Democrat on my committee, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and with strong support of our subcommittee and strong support of the House, I am most certain that we will this year, as we did last year, prevail once again in Conference.

I thank very much the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her motion to instruct the conferees, which I wholeheartedly support, and I urge the House to adopt her motion.