

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 82, nays 334, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—82

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Obey
Ackerman	Gephardt	Oliver
Allen	Harman	Owens
Andrews	Hillery	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hostettler	Pastor
Becerra	Hoyer	Payne
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Borski	(TX)	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Johnson (WI)	Salmon
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Sawyer
Coyne	Kaptur	Scarborough
Davis (FL)	Kennelly	Shadegg
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Solomon
DeFazio	Kind (WI)	Strickland
Delahunt	Levin	Stupak
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Tauscher
Deutsch	Lowe	Tierney
Doggett	Markey	Torres
Eshoo	Martinez	Towns
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Velazquez
Farr	McDermott	Vento
Fattah	McGovern	Visclosky
Fazio	McNulty	Waters
Filner	Miller (CA)	Waxman
Ford	Mink	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Myrick	

NAYS—334

Aderholt	Burton	Dellums
Archer	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Armey	Callahan	Dickey
Bachus	Calvert	Dicks
Baesler	Camp	Dingell
Baker	Campbell	Dixon
Baldacci	Canady	Dooley
Ballenger	Cannon	Doolittle
Barcia	Capps	Doyle
Barr	Cardin	Dreier
Barrett (NE)	Carson	Duncan
Bartlett	Castle	Dunn
Barton	Chabot	Ehlers
Bass	Chambliss	Ehrlich
Bateman	Chenoweth	Emerson
Bentsen	Christensen	Engel
Bereuter	Clay	English
Berman	Clayton	Ensign
Bilbray	Coble	Etheridge
Bilirakis	Coburn	Everett
Bishop	Collins	Ewing
Blagojevich	Combest	Fawell
Bliley	Condit	Flake
Blumenauer	Cook	Foley
Blunt	Cooksey	Forbes
Boehrlert	Costello	Fowler
Boehner	Cramer	Fox
Bono	Crane	Franks (NJ)
Boswell	Crapo	Frelinghuysen
Boucher	Cubin	Frost
Boyd	Cummings	Furse
Brady	Cunningham	Gallegly
Brown (CA)	Danner	Ganske
Brown (FL)	Davis (VA)	Gekas
Bryant	Deal	Gilchrest
Bunning	DeGette	Gillmor
Burr	DeLay	Gilman

Goode	Manzullo	Rush
Goodlatte	Mascara	Ryun
Goodling	Matsui	Sabo
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez
Goss	McCollum	Sandlin
Graham	McCrery	Sanford
Granger	McDade	Saxton
Green	McHale	Schaefer, Dan
Greenwood	McHugh	Schaffer, Bob
Gutierrez	McIntosh	Schumer
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Scott
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	McKinney	Serrano
Hamilton	Meehan	Sessions
Hansen	Meek	Shaw
Hastert	Menendez	Shays
Hastings (WA)	Metcalfe	Sherman
Hayworth	Mica	Shimkus
Hefley	Millender-McDonald	Shuster
Herger	Miller (FL)	Sisisky
Hill	Minge	Skaggs
Hilliard	Moakley	Skeen
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Skelton
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Slaughter
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Smith (MI)
Holden	Morella	Smith (NJ)
Hooley	Murtha	Smith (OR)
Horn	Nadler	Smith (TX)
Houghton	Neal	Smith, Adam
Hulshof	Nethercutt	Smith, Linda
Hunter	Neumann	Snowbarger
Hutchinson	Ney	Snyder
Hyde	Northup	Souder
Inglis	Norwood	Spence
Istook	Nussle	Spratt
Jenkins	Oberstar	Stabenow
John	Ortiz	Stark
Johnson (CT)	Packard	Stearns
Johnson, Sam	Pappas	Stenholm
Jones	Parker	Stokes
Kanjorski	Pascrell	Stump
Kasich	Paul	Sununu
Kennedy (MA)	Paxon	Talent
Kennedy (RI)	Pease	Tanner
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Tauzin
Kim	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (MS)
King (NY)	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Kingston	Pickering	Thomas
Klecza	Pickett	Thompson
Klink	Pitts	Thornberry
Klug	Pombo	Thune
Knollenberg	Porter	Thurman
Kolbe	Portman	Tiahrt
Kucinich	Poshard	Trafigant
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Turner
LaHood	Pryce (OH)	Upton
Lampson	Quinn	Walsh
Lantos	Radanovich	Wamp
Latham	Rahall	Watkins
LaTourette	Ramstad	Watt (NC)
Lazio	Redmond	Watt (OK)
Leach	Regula	Weldon (PA)
Lewis (CA)	Reyes	Weller
Lewis (KY)	Riggs	Wexler
Linder	Riley	Weygand
Lipinski	Rivers	White
Livingston	Roemer	Whitfield
LoBiondo	Rogers	Wicker
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Wise
Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
Luther	Rothman	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Roukema	Yates
Maloney (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
Manton	Royce	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Bonilla	Gonzalez	Oxley
Clement	Hastings (FL)	Rogan
Cox	Hefner	Sanders
Edwards	Hinchey	Schiff
Foglietta	Largent	Weldon (FL)
Gibbons	McInnis	

□ 1143

Mr. PEASE and Mr. MCINTOSH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2266, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 242 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 242

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2266) making appropriations 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 (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 242 is a very straightforward rule that allows the House to consider the conference report on H.R. 2266 for fiscal year 1998 Department of Defense Appropriations Act. As is customary for this type of legislation, the rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule further provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Madam Speaker, the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Security, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], have done outstanding work in bringing forward this legislation. In our Committee on Rules meeting last evening, they received accolades for all of their efforts that went into crafting this extraordinarily important bill, accolades that came from all Members that were heartfelt and well-deserved.

In ensuring that we adequately fund all the necessary elements of our national defense, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] have worked together in a spirit of bipartisan cooperation that is most fitting for an issue that I believe should always transcend partisan differences, and that is, of course, our national defense. The readiness and morale of our troops, the technical superiority of our equipment, and the integrity of the information that is provided to our warfighters and our policymakers, these are matters that are too important to be sidetracked by political mischief.

As chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have had the great good fortune to work closely with the defense appropriators, moving through the tandem authorization and appropriations dance carefully and deliberately, step by step, to make sure our national intelligence needs are fully met.

I believe the final product the House will consider today, demonstrates that Congress can and will exercise prudent oversight, working in partnership with the Commander in Chief, to protect American lives and interests both at home and abroad. We are clearly showing that we can fulfill this vital obligation within the constraints of a balanced-budget framework.

Everyone knows that there were tough issues to be resolved in this legislation, not just among our House colleagues, but with the other body and the administration as well, among them some big policy questions. Of course, the bill before us today is the product of tough negotiations and some clear compromises from all sides on specific programs and language. That is the way it always has been and always will be. That is why we are here. But this bill says to our friends and our enemies around the world that we will not compromise our core commitment to providing for the best possible national defense for the United States of America and its people. That is the message we must continue to send, and it will be heard.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this rule, which I believe is noncontroversial, and this legislation which is critical to the well-being of our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the conference report. The conference report provides the funds for our national security, the funds to defend our borders and our way of life, and the funds to ensure that the United States remains the world's leader in military might.

This conference report lives up to the commitment that this Congress made when we passed the balanced budget this summer, but it also realistically faces and addresses the needs of each of the branches of our armed services. This conference report does not provide for every need, but it certainly addresses priorities and accordingly deserves the support of every Member of this body.

Madam Speaker, this conference agreement continues the Congress' commitment to ensuring that our fighting forces are equipped with the best. This commitment assures, as best we can, that should our Nation become embroiled in a military engagement, our Armed Forces can fight and win with the least number of American casualties as is possible. But more important, Madam Speaker, our Armed

Forces represent the best trained and best equipped military in the world, which will make our enemies think twice before provoking a confrontation.

As General Shalikhavili said yesterday in his speech to the National Press Club, "An ounce of prevention is worth more than a pound of cure." This bill provides our military with far more than an ounce of prevention, and hopefully we will not have to test the cure.

This bill ensures that our fighting forces now and in the future will be equipped to fight and win. The conference agreement provides for \$2 billion to continue the development of the F-22 fighter, the next generation fighter aircraft for the Air Force. The B-2 bomber funding level has been cut by \$176 million from the House-passed amount, but the \$331 million in the conference agreement still includes funds which may be used for the procurement of long-lead-term components to restart the B-2 production line. In addition, Madam Speaker, the conference agreement includes \$627 million for the procurement in fiscal year 1998 of seven new B-22 Osprey tiltrotor aircraft for the Marine Corps, and an additional \$62.1 million for advanced procurement of seven more aircraft in fiscal year 1999.

Madam Speaker, this conference agreement totals \$247.7 billion in budget authority and is consistent with the overall fiscal year 1998 defense spending totals agreed to by the President and the Congress in the 1997 budget agreement. I commend the conferees for bringing a good product back to the House and urge passage of this important appropriations bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 3, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey

Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr

Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra

Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Billakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
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
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
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
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr

Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoolley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(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)
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
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	Shuster	Thune
Riley	Sisisky	Thurman
Rivers	Skaggs	Tiaht
Rodriguez	Skeen	Tierney
Roemer	Skelton	Torres
Rogers	Slaughter	Towns
Rohrabacher	Smith (MI)	Trafficant
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Turner
Rothman	Smith (OR)	Upton
Roukema	Smith (TX)	Velazquez
Roybal-Allard	Smith, Adam	Vento
Royce	Smith, Linda	Visclosky
Rush	Snowbarger	Walsh
Ryun	Snyder	Wamp
Sabo	Solomon	Waters
Salmon	Souder	Watkins
Sanchez	Spence	Watt (NC)
Sanders	Spratt	Watts (OK)
Sandlin	Stabenow	Waxman
Sanford	Stark	Weldon (FL)
Sawyer	Stearns	Weller
Saxton	Stenholm	Wexler
Scarborough	Stokes	Weygand
Schaefer, Dan	Strickland	White
Schaffer, Bob	Stump	Whitfield
Schumer	Stupak	Wicker
Scott	Sununu	Wise
Sensenbrenner	Talent	Wolf
Serrano	Tanner	Woolsey
Sessions	Tauscher	Wynn
Shadegg	Taylor (MS)	Yates
Shaw	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Shays	Thomas	Young (FL)
Sherman	Thompson	
Shimkus	Thornberry	

NAYS—3

Manton	Ortiz	Weldon (PA)
--------	-------	-------------

NOT VOTING—11

Bonilla	Gonzalez	Rogan
DeGette	Hastings (FL)	Schiff
Foglietta	Linder	Tauzin
Gibbons	McInnis	

□ 1212

Messrs. SHADEGG, VENTO, PITTS, JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 242, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2266) making appropriations 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.

□ 1215

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 242, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, September 23, 1997, at page H7656.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] opposed to the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] opposed to the conference report?

Mr. MURTHA. Madam Speaker, I support it slightly.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I claim 20 minutes in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2266 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to point out that this has been a rather grueling task to get us to the point

where we are today. And with the strong cooperation of the members of the subcommittee on our side, on the Republican side, and on the Democratic side led by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the tremendous work of our staff with the principal staffer director Kevin Roper and the staff that worked with him, as well as Greg Dahlberg, who is the principal staffer of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], we have put together what I think is an excellent defense bill, with one major problem.

The major problem is there are so many other items that we ought to be considering and providing for in this bill that we do not because the 602(b) allocations were not adequate to fund the necessary things that we felt were important to our Nation's security and also to the welfare and the care of those who serve in uniform.

But because of the strong work done by all of those folks involved, we have a good bill. It provides the prioritized requirements of the Defense Department for all of the services. It makes a very strong statement on providing what is needed for quality of life for those who wear the uniform in defense of our Nation.

Without going into a lot of detail, the bill is pretty much like it was when it passed the House before, with the exception that by the time we got to conference, our 602 allocation was reduced, so we had to reduce the number in the bill by over \$600 million.

Now, despite all of that, we came to conference nearly \$9 billion apart on specific items. Because of the very good cooperation with our counterparts, and I want to specifically mention Senator STEVENS and Senator INOUE and the Members on the Senate side, we have crafted a conference report that is, in my opinion, one of the best we have presented to the House.

At this point I would like to insert a summary of the conference agreement for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2266)

	FY 1997 Enacted 3/	FY 1998 Estimate 2/	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I						
MILITARY PERSONNEL						
Military Personnel, Army	20,633,998,000	20,492,257,000	20,445,381,000	20,426,457,000	20,452,057,000	-181,941,000
Military Personnel, Navy	16,986,976,000	16,501,118,000	16,504,911,000	16,508,218,000	16,493,518,000	-493,458,000
Military Personnel, Marine Corps	6,111,728,000	6,147,599,000	6,141,635,000	6,148,899,000	6,137,899,000	+26,171,000
Military Personnel, Air Force	17,069,490,000	17,154,556,000	17,044,874,000	17,206,056,000	17,102,120,000	+32,630,000
Reserve Personnel, Army	2,073,479,000	2,024,446,000	2,045,615,000	2,037,046,000	2,032,046,000	-41,433,000
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,405,606,000	1,375,401,000	1,377,249,000	1,374,901,000	1,376,601,000	-29,005,000
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	388,643,000	381,070,000	391,953,000	384,770,000	391,770,000	+3,127,000
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	783,697,000	814,936,000	814,772,000	815,745,000	815,915,000	+32,218,000
National Guard Personnel, Army	3,266,393,000	3,200,667,000	3,245,387,000	3,446,867,000	3,333,867,000	+67,474,000
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	1,296,490,000	1,319,712,000	1,331,417,000	1,334,712,000	1,334,712,000	+38,222,000
Total, title I, Military Personnel	70,016,500,000	69,411,762,000	69,343,194,000	69,683,671,000	69,470,505,000	-545,995,000
TITLE II						
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
Operation and Maintenance, Army	17,519,340,000	17,049,484,000	17,078,218,000	16,913,473,000	16,754,306,000	-765,034,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	20,061,961,000	21,508,130,000	21,779,365,000	21,576,419,000	21,617,766,000	+1,555,805,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,254,119,000	2,301,345,000	2,598,032,000	2,328,535,000	2,372,635,000	+118,516,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	17,263,193,000	18,817,785,000	18,740,167,000	18,592,385,000	18,492,883,000	+1,229,690,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	10,044,200,000	10,390,938,000	10,053,956,000	10,399,638,000	10,369,740,000	+325,540,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,119,436,000	1,192,891,000	1,207,891,000	1,212,891,000	1,207,891,000	+88,455,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	886,027,000	834,711,000	924,711,000	834,211,000	921,711,000	+35,684,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	109,667,000	110,366,000	119,266,000	110,366,000	116,366,000	+6,699,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,496,553,000	1,624,420,000	1,635,250,000	1,631,200,000	1,632,030,000	+135,477,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,254,477,000	2,258,932,000	2,313,632,000	2,449,932,000	2,419,632,000	+165,155,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	2,716,379,000	2,991,219,000	2,995,719,000	3,010,282,000	3,013,282,000	+296,903,000
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	1,140,157,000	1,467,500,000	1,855,400,000	1,889,000,000	1,884,000,000	+743,843,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	6,797,000	6,952,000	6,952,000	6,952,000	6,952,000	+155,000
Environmental Restoration, Army	339,109,000	377,337,000	377,337,000	375,337,000	375,337,000	+36,228,000
Environmental Restoration, Navy	287,788,000	277,500,000	277,500,000	275,500,000	275,500,000	-12,288,000
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	394,010,000	378,900,000	378,900,000	376,900,000	376,900,000	-17,110,000
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	36,722,000	27,900,000	27,900,000	26,900,000	26,900,000	-9,822,000
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	256,387,000	202,300,000	202,300,000	242,300,000	242,300,000	-14,087,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	49,000,000	80,130,000	55,557,000	40,130,000	47,130,000	-1,870,000
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	327,900,000	382,200,000	284,700,000	382,200,000	382,200,000	+54,300,000
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense	600,000,000	100,000,000	360,000,000	-240,000,000
Total, title II, Operation and maintenance	79,163,222,000	82,280,940,000	82,912,753,000	82,774,551,000	82,895,461,000	+3,732,239,000
(By transfer)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)
TITLE III						
PROCUREMENT						
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,348,434,000	1,029,459,000	1,541,217,000	1,356,959,000	1,346,317,000	-2,117,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(133,000,000)
Missile Procurement, Army	1,041,867,000	1,178,151,000	771,942,000	1,173,081,000	762,409,000	-279,458,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army ..	1,470,286,000	1,065,707,000	1,332,907,000	1,156,506,000	1,298,707,000	-171,579,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,127,149,000	890,902,000	1,062,802,000	1,042,602,000	1,037,202,000	-89,947,000
Other Procurement, Army	3,172,485,000	2,455,030,000	2,502,886,000	2,783,735,000	2,679,130,000	-493,355,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	7,027,010,000	5,951,965,000	6,753,465,000	6,312,937,000	6,535,444,000	-491,566,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(134,000,000)
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,389,913,000	1,136,293,000	1,175,393,000	1,138,393,000	1,102,193,000	-287,720,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	289,695,000	336,797,000	423,797,000	344,797,000	397,547,000	+107,852,000
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	5,613,665,000	7,438,158,000	7,628,158,000	8,510,458,000	8,235,591,000	+2,621,926,000
Other Procurement, Navy	3,067,944,000	2,825,500,000	3,084,485,000	2,832,800,000	3,144,205,000	+76,261,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	569,073,000	374,306,000	491,198,000	440,106,000	482,398,000	-86,675,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	6,404,980,000	5,684,847,000	6,386,479,000	6,390,847,000	6,480,983,000	+76,003,000
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(133,000,000)
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,297,145,000	2,557,741,000	2,320,741,000	2,411,741,000	2,394,202,000	+97,057,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	293,153,000	403,984,000	414,884,000	400,984,000	398,534,000	+105,381,000
Other Procurement, Air Force	5,944,680,000	6,561,253,000	6,588,939,000	6,653,053,000	6,592,909,000	+648,229,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide	1,978,005,000	1,695,085,000	2,186,669,000	1,753,285,000	2,106,444,000	+128,439,000
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	780,000,000	850,000,000	653,000,000	653,000,000	-127,000,000
Total, title III, Procurement	43,815,484,000	41,585,178,000	45,515,962,000	45,355,284,000	45,647,215,000	+1,831,731,000
(By transfer)	(400,000,000)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2266) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted 3/	FY 1998 Estimate 2/	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE IV						
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION						
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army.....	5,062,763,000	4,510,843,000	4,686,427,000	4,984,083,000	5,156,507,000	+93,744,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy.....	8,208,946,000	7,611,022,000	7,907,837,000	7,532,846,000	8,115,686,000	-93,260,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force.....	14,499,606,000	14,451,379,000	14,313,456,000	14,127,873,000	14,507,804,000	+8,198,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide.....	9,362,800,000	9,069,680,000	9,509,337,000	9,608,689,000	9,821,760,000	+458,960,000
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	282,038,000	268,183,000	268,183,000	251,183,000	258,183,000	-23,855,000
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense.....	24,968,000	23,384,000	32,684,000	31,384,000	31,384,000	+6,416,000
Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation..	37,441,121,000	35,934,491,000	36,717,924,000	36,536,058,000	37,891,324,000	+450,203,000
TITLE V						
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS						
DBOF/Defense Working Capital Funds.....	947,900,000	33,400,000	971,952,000	871,952,000	971,952,000	+24,052,000
Military Commissary Fund, Defense.....		938,552,000				
National Defense Sealift Fund:						
Ready Reserve Force.....	266,000,000	302,000,000	302,000,000	278,000,000	302,000,000	+36,000,000
Acquisition.....	1,162,002,000	889,426,000	897,926,000	238,126,000	772,948,000	-389,054,000
Total.....	1,428,002,000	1,191,426,000	1,199,926,000	516,126,000	1,074,948,000	-353,054,000
Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds.....	2,375,902,000	2,163,378,000	2,171,878,000	1,388,078,000	2,046,900,000	-329,002,000
TITLE VI						
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS						
Defense Health Program:						
Operation and maintenance.....	9,937,838,000	10,027,582,000	10,035,682,000	10,043,607,000	10,095,007,000	+157,169,000
Procurement.....	269,470,000	274,068,000	274,068,000	274,068,000	274,068,000	+4,598,000
Total, Defense Health Program.....	10,207,308,000	10,301,650,000	10,309,750,000	10,317,675,000	10,369,075,000	+161,767,000
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense: 1/						
Operation and maintenance.....	478,947,000	472,200,000	472,200,000	467,200,000	462,200,000	-16,747,000
Procurement.....	191,200,000	82,200,000	67,200,000	77,200,000	72,200,000	-119,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	88,300,000	66,300,000	56,300,000	70,300,000	66,300,000	-22,000,000
Economic assumptions.....				-5,000,000		
Total, Chemical Agents.....	758,447,000	620,700,000	595,700,000	609,700,000	600,700,000	-157,747,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense.....	807,800,000	652,582,000	713,082,000	691,482,000	712,882,000	-94,918,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	139,157,000	138,380,000	142,980,000	135,380,000	138,380,000	-777,000
Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs.....	11,912,712,000	11,713,312,000	11,761,512,000	11,754,237,000	11,821,037,000	-91,675,000
TITLE VII						
RELATED AGENCIES						
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System						
Fund.....	196,400,000	196,900,000	196,900,000	196,900,000	196,900,000	+500,000
Intelligence Community Management Account.....	129,164,000	122,580,000	125,580,000	122,580,000	121,080,000	-8,084,000
Transfer to Dept of Justice.....	(27,000,000)	(27,000,000)	(27,000,000)		(27,000,000)	
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and						
Environmental Restoration Fund.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	+25,000,000
National Security Education Trust Fund.....	5,100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-3,100,000
Total, title VII, Related agencies.....	340,664,000	331,480,000	334,480,000	356,480,000	354,980,000	+14,316,000
TITLE VIII						
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Additional transfer authority (sec. 8005).....	(2,000,000,000)	(2,500,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	
Indian Financing Act incentives (sec. 8024).....				8,000,000	8,000,000	+8,000,000
Disposal & lease of DOD real property (sec. 8044).....	26,565,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	+37,435,000
Overseas Military Fac Investment Recovery (sec. 8049).....	1,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+29,000,000
National Science Center, Army (sec. 8057).....	120,000					-120,000
Export loan guarantee PGM (sec. 8081).....	1,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	
Rescissions (sec. 8064).....	-137,108,000		-160,100,000	-94,700,000	-176,100,000	-38,992,000
Coast Guard transfer.....	300,000,000			300,000,000		-300,000,000
Navy/Air Force flying hour offset.....				-600,000,000		
Flying Hour/readiness offset (sec. 8043).....					-1,253,000,000	-1,253,000,000
Excess funded carryover.....	-150,000,000					+150,000,000
RDT&E general reduction.....	-680,552,000					+680,552,000
Air Force DBOF pass through.....	-194,500,000					+194,500,000
FFRDC's/consultants (sec. 8035).....	-154,572,000		-141,300,000	-71,800,000	-71,800,000	+82,772,000
Advisory and assistance services (sec. 8041).....				-300,000,000	-300,000,000	-300,000,000
Weapons of Mass Destruction.....	100,000,000					-100,000,000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2266) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted 3/	FY 1998 Estimate 2/	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Anti-terrorism, counter-terrorism, and security enhancement activities:						
Emergency funding, FY 1997	230,680,000					-230,680,000
General reduction	-230,680,000					+230,680,000
RDT&E, Def-Wide dual-use program	100,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	-98,000,000
Fisher Houses (sec. 8100)		1,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	+1,000,000
Travel Cards (sec. 8101)		5,000,000	5,000,000		5,000,000	+5,000,000
Warranties (sec. 8106)			-50,000,000		-75,000,000	-75,000,000
Excess Inventory (sec. 8105)			-100,000,000		-100,000,000	-100,000,000
Shared Cleanup Costs			-73,000,000			
National Missile Defense Offset (sec. 8048)					-474,000,000	-474,000,000
Intrepid (sec. 8097)					13,000,000	+13,000,000
Expiring Balances (sec. 8127)					-100,000,000	-100,000,000
National Security Strategy Study Group (sec. 8130)					3,000,000	+3,000,000
Lexington Bluegrass (sec. 8128)					4,000,000	+4,000,000
Total, title VIII	-788,047,000	103,000,000	-422,400,000	-663,500,000	-2,418,900,000	-1,630,853,000
Effect of P.L. 105-18:						
Rescissions, FY93 - FY96	-464,102,000					+464,102,000
Rescissions, FY 1997	-1,270,050,000					+1,270,050,000
Emergency funding	1,846,200,000					-1,846,200,000
Non-emergency funding	76,800,000					-76,800,000
Net total effect of P.L. 105-18	188,848,000					-188,848,000
Grand total	244,466,406,000	243,523,541,000	248,335,303,000	247,184,859,000	247,708,522,000	+3,242,116,000
(By transfer)	(177,000,000)	(577,000,000)	(177,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(177,000,000)	
BUDGET SCOREKEEPING ADJUSTMENTS						
Adjustment for unapprop'd balance transfer (Stockpile)	150,000,000	550,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	
Stockpile collections (unappropriated)	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	-150,000,000	
Emergency funding for anti-terrorism	-230,680,000					+230,680,000
Emergency funding (P.L. 105-18)	-1,846,000,000					+1,846,000,000
Total adjustments	-2,076,680,000	400,000,000				+2,076,680,000
RECAPITULATION						
Title I - Military Personnel	70,016,500,000	69,411,762,000	69,343,194,000	69,683,671,000	69,470,505,000	-545,995,000
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	79,163,222,000	82,280,940,000	82,912,753,000	82,774,551,000	82,895,461,000	+3,732,239,000
(By transfer)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	
Title III - Procurement	43,815,484,000	41,585,178,000	45,515,962,000	45,355,284,000	45,647,215,000	+1,831,731,000
(By transfer)		(400,000,000)				
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	37,441,121,000	35,934,491,000	36,717,924,000	36,536,058,000	37,891,324,000	+450,203,000
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	2,375,902,000	2,163,378,000	2,171,878,000	1,388,078,000	2,046,900,000	-329,002,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	11,912,712,000	11,713,312,000	11,761,512,000	11,754,237,000	11,821,037,000	-91,675,000
Title VII - Related agencies	340,664,000	331,480,000	334,480,000	356,480,000	354,980,000	+14,316,000
Title VIII - General provisions	-788,047,000	103,000,000	-422,400,000	-663,500,000	-2,418,900,000	-1,630,853,000
(Additional transfer authority)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,500,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	(2,000,000,000)	
Net effect of P.L. 105-18	188,848,000					-188,848,000
Total, Department of Defense	244,466,406,000	243,523,541,000	248,335,303,000	247,184,859,000	247,708,522,000	+3,242,116,000
Scorekeeping adjustments	-2,076,680,000	400,000,000				+2,076,680,000
Grand total	242,389,726,000	243,923,541,000	248,335,303,000	247,184,859,000	247,708,522,000	+5,318,796,000
Allocation recap (sec. 302b):						
Mandatory	196,400,000	196,900,000	196,900,000	196,900,000	196,900,000	+500,000
Discretionary:						
Non-defense		27,000,000	27,000,000		27,000,000	+27,000,000
Defense	242,193,326,000	243,699,641,000	248,111,403,000	246,987,959,000	247,484,622,000	+5,291,296,000
Emergency funding (P.L. 105-18)	-1,846,000,000					+1,846,000,000
Total Defense	242,193,326,000	243,699,641,000	248,111,403,000	246,987,959,000	247,484,622,000	+5,291,296,000
Total discretionary	242,193,326,000	243,726,641,000	248,138,403,000	246,987,959,000	247,511,622,000	+5,318,296,000
Grand total	242,389,726,000	243,923,541,000	248,335,303,000	247,184,859,000	247,708,522,000	+5,318,796,000

1/ Included in Budget under Procurement title.

2/ FY 1998 budget request reflects a budget amendment to cover a shortfall in the DHP, as follows: Military Personnel -\$62,000,000; O&M -\$199,000,000 and Defense Health Program +\$261,000,000.

3/ FY 1997 enacted reflects new budget authority of \$1,923,000,000 and rescissions of \$1,734,152,000, as enacted in P.L. 105-18.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the chairman of the committee, in a colloquy on a matter of great concern to me.

This conference report reduces the budget request for operating the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office, or DARO, by about \$14 million. In taking this action, it is my understanding that the conferees were silent regarding changes in the subordination, mission, size, and structure of this office. As I understand it, these matters relating to DARO will be addressed in the defense authorization conference, which has not yet concluded.

Is this the understanding of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] that that is correct. That is my understanding and that is my intent.

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I would also then like to ask my colleague whether it is his view that, should the Secretary of Defense choose to seek approval for a reprogramming action for any or all of this \$14 million, the committee would be willing to consider such a request, depending, of course, on the outcome of the authorization conference?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, again I would say to my colleague, if the Secretary decides that this is a high priority item, I definitely would consider a request for reprogramming under our usual procedures.

Mr. SISISKY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SISISKY. Madam Speaker, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the committee, in a matter that is of concern to me.

I understand there is report language in this bill which requires the Navy to report back to the Congress on the impact pilot program now being conducted at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. I would simply ask the chairman to clarify the intent of this language. Is the language in fact directed solely at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would respond to the question of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] by saying yes and say to him that this language addresses only the notion of combining a Fleet Intermediate Maintenance Facility with a naval shipyard at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. This language is not intended to, in any way, impact ongoing regional maintenance activities at any other shipyard.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, in section 8123 of the conference report, the Secretary of Defense is given the authority to waive Buy American restrictions under certain conditions. I am very concerned about the potential economic impact that would result if the Secretary uses this authority in the area of specialty metals.

To avoid any negative impact, I believe the Secretary should not waive the Buy American restrictions for products classified under the headings of 8211 through 8215 in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]. The committee would be gravely concerned if the Secretary waived Buy American provisions for those products. And I would say to the gentleman that we believe that the conference report actually strengthens the Buy American situation as it exists today.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] would continue to yield, I appreciate his attention to this vital concern.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I believe the conference committee did, given what it had to work with, a very good job. I was particularly pleased that they have adopted language which will enable the President to refuse to go ahead with any new B-2 bombers. I assume, given the President's strong position on this and the Pentagon's opposition to new B-2 bombers, that he will in fact use this authority and we will not be further committing to the construction of new B-2 bombers.

But there is still a fundamental problem with the bill. I want to talk about two of them. First, it continues to spend too much money. Roughly 50 percent of the discretionary spending allowed to the Federal Government under the recently signed budget deal will be consumed by the military and related intelligence functions. Every other function of the Government, environment, public safety here at home, transportation, they are all going to suffer increasingly from inadequate funding.

I am a supporter of the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], who chairs the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to get more funding for highway and transit funds. I believe we have a very serious problem here which could be alleviated in part by increased funding.

I think we would better serve the true security needs of the American

people by diverting some of the funds that now go for national security in the strictly military sense to improving our security here through improving our infrastructure.

There are a number of things in the bill that I would object to. But I want to talk about one particular area where we are spending tens of billions, wholly unnecessarily, and not because of any national security need of the United States, properly understood.

This bill, not through the fault necessarily of the Members here, but because this administration, as every one before it, has acquiesced in a policy of allowing our Western European allies and some of our Asian allies to take a free ride on the U.S. Government.

Let me give an example. We are about, once again, to get into a debate about pulling out of Bosnia. I voted to have the American troops withdraw from Bosnia. I voted to have American troops withdrawn in December. I think we should be proud of the intervention that we made that stopped a serious loss of life, and I think they have made some progress towards improvement, although I am not hopeful that we will ultimately get where we should be.

But there are two separate questions that are being treated as one. First, should there be a continued presentation of military forces in Bosnia to try to enforce basic human rights? And second, must the United States be a part of it?

The United States, without any help from our European allies, stands in South Korea along with the South Koreans, as we have to these days, to deter and, hopefully it will not happen, but if necessary, to repel an attack from North Korea.

The United States takes the leading military role with very little help from our European allies in trying to enforce peace in the Middle East, confronting the Iraqi and Iranian regimes. The United States, of course, takes the leading role in our own hemisphere, in Haiti and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, is it never Europe's turn? Is there never a time when we can ask our Western European allies to carry on without us? And I know what they are now saying. They are saying that there will not be a European military presence in Bosnia unless the United States is a part of it.

I think we should do our part, and I think it is important to be there. But I do not understand why our wealthy European allies cannot take on their share of the burden. And I say this for this reason: If we look at military expenditures as a percentage of gross domestic product, as a percentage of Government expenditures, the U.S. percentage dwarfs our European allies.

I believe, by the way, that the problem is not that they spend too little but that we spend too much. I am not asking them to get up to our level. I am saying that a situation in which they pressure us to spend excessively is a mistake. I do believe with regard to

the Bosnian situation that it is fair for us to ask Germany, Italy, France, England, and the Scandinavian countries and the Benelux countries and others to do this. I do not understand why they are not capable without us of dealing with Western Europe.

We have the obligation in the Middle East. We have the obligation in Haiti. We have the obligation in South Korea. I support our involvement in all those areas. But I do not understand why we allow it to be so one-sided.

And it is not simply Bosnia that is the problem. The Bosnian situation, if that were the only one, it would not cause such a great problem. The problem is this: We continue to spend tens of billions of dollars for the military defense of Western Europe. We cannot know exactly how much because they will not tell us.

That is wasted money. It is spent for very brave people. It is spent for very good equipment. The problem is not the people and equipment. The problem is there is no necessity. The only reason we are militarily committed to the defense of Western Europe is cultural lack.

□ 1230

There was a serious threat 50 years ago to European countries from a totalitarian aggressive regime, and they were poor and not able to defend themselves. That threat has disappeared. They are now wealthy. And we continue to spend. I cite the Bosnian thing only because it is an example of the mindset that Europe cannot defend itself.

As I said, I am not asking for a considerable expenditure increase in Europe. I am saying that the Europeans should understand, and we ought to take the lead in cutting back substantially on the American military presence in Western Europe which serves no purpose from the standpoint of defense.

If we are talking about the need for bases which can go forward into other areas, then let us do it on that score. But that is not what has happened. What has happened is that we continue to plan for a defense of Western Europe militarily, and what we really ought to have is an essay contest, Madam Speaker. Let us have an essay contest and give a prize to anybody who can identify that threat to Western Europe that we are spending tens of billions of dollars to deter, because that is what is happening, and we are doing it at the cost here of important programs.

If you live in Western Europe and you lose your job, you do not have to worry about losing your health care. In fact, some people believe that Western Europe is not doing enough to allow for some instability in jobs. But one thing we know is if people lose their jobs in Western Europe, they will not lose their health care. If you lose your job in America, you probably lose your health care, particularly if you are in the manufacturing area. Why can the

Europeans afford to do so much more with health care than we can? Because we are defending them militarily against a nonexistent threat.

So I want to be clear. I am not insisting that they do more, I am insisting that they take responsibility for their own defense. Indeed, I think nothing we could do would more graphically improve the sense of security in Western Europe than to tell them that they were in charge of their own defense, because I guarantee you that if we told the Western Europeans they were in charge of their own military defense, they would suddenly feel a lot safer than they do today. As long as the American taxpayer is going to pay for their defense, they are very insecure, and they tell us we need to be there. If they were told that they were in charge of their own defense, I think they would acknowledge the fact that they are not threatened, and they could maintain a reasonable level.

Let me make a connection, Madam Speaker. We are debating here the question of fast track. We are debating the question of international trade. One of the reasons you have so much resistance on the part of American workers, which I share, to further international trade is that we now leave them unprotected if they happen to be the losers when international trade goes forward. And there will be winners and losers. I believe there will probably be more winners than losers, but there will be losers. We have a social and economic system now that leaves the losers unprotected. Increase the social safety net for those who will be the losers in the transitional impact in international trade, and you cut back their resistance.

When John Kennedy launched the Alliance for Progress, he looked back to Franklin Roosevelt's good neighbor policy in Latin America, and he said, talking about how Roosevelt had pioneered internationalism economically, Franklin Roosevelt could be a good neighbor abroad because he was a good neighbor at home.

Those who want America to be more forthcoming internationally in the economic area have to understand that part of that resistance comes from American workers who feel they will not be fairly treated in the transition. One way to do that is to stop committing tens of billions of dollars, as this bill continues to do, for the military defense of our wealthy allies in Western Europe against a nonexistent threat. I would hope that we would change this policy, we would tell our Western European allies that yes, we think the Bosnian thing is important, and we have taken a major role, and American air and sea power would remain available if it had to be called in, but the ground presence in Bosnia ought to be the Western European ground presence.

There is no rational argument why those countries, together having hundreds of millions of people, having the

economy they have, could not do that work. That would be a first step in our making substantial reductions in our military expenditures, leaving no vital interest unprotected, putting ourselves at no military disadvantage, but simply adapting to the current reality that our wealthy Western European allies face no threat that they cannot handle themselves, and certainly nothing that justifies the tens of billions of dollars of continued expenditures of American money that comes out of other important programs, or out of deficit reduction, or out of tax reduction. Members would have the choice how to deal with it. For that reason, Madam Speaker, I will oppose this conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, it is amazing for those that talk about the defense budget is too much, that have never served in the armed services and seen hostility or even seen the odd end of a weapon, but yet we ask our men and women to do that every single day. Too much, but our budget is less than it was in 1930.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. Bosnia, by the time we pull out in June, is going to cost the United States \$12 billion. Does it come out of the social programs? No. It comes out of the already limited budget that we have before you today.

I was asked why do we have aircraft that are crashing all over the United States? Listen to this. Air Force; high operational tempo; keeping aging planes going with a lack of maintenance, shrinking budgets; recent series of aircraft accidents according to Air Force officials. We are asking our men and women to fly these machines with one-half the flying time that they should. The maintenance on the aircraft is not being done. Yet we do not have the dollars in here to put into it because the dollars that we do have comes out to pay for Bosnia and other contingencies.

In Haiti, Aristide is still there. Aideed's son is in Somalia. That costs billions of dollars; not out of social programs, but defense.

Our committee has done a good job, but when people sit back and say that we are spending too much on defense, I would ask you to take a look at what our kids are doing. We have not bought a new Air Force fighter in 25 years. The SU-27, the SU-35 and the SU-37, the Russian airplane, outclasses, outperforms our F-14 and our F-15. The AA-12 and the AA-10 missile that the Russians have outclasses our best AMRAAM missile, but yet the cold war is over. And they are shipping them to China and every country that is a potential threat to our men and women. Are we spending enough, Madam Speaker? Absolutely not.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the leaders of the Committee on National Security. It looks like the B-2, which I was going to spend a lot more of my attention than is now going to be necessary, is moving toward its well-deserved fate, and all of you have had something to do with it. I still have problems with this two-war strategy that now fuels a \$250 billion military piece. I think that is a little too much. The *Seawolf* submarine, the nuclear submarine, when I was the chairman, we were holding hearings on the *Seawolf* submarine. Star Wars has been reconfigured at least a half a dozen times. They throw it out, reinvent it, and come up with some more stuff. There are too many F-22s. In other words, there is way too much, \$247 billion worth, in this kind of global situation that we find ourselves in.

Madam Speaker, it is too much dough. We have got to cut it down. We have got to reduce it. I hope that you who lead this committee will continue to give that at least if not your undivided attention, more of your attention. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume only to say again that this is a good bill. It meets most of the needs of the Department of Defense and those who serve in the uniform.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] for the tremendous support and cooperation that we gave each other and all the members of the subcommittee, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HEFFNER, Mr. SABO, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I want to also compliment the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for having helped us through some difficult times when some major decisions had to be made.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to declare my pride at the inclusion of \$160 million for breast cancer-related research in the fiscal year 1998 Defense appropriations bill. This figure represents a significant 42-percent increase over last year's appropriation. Breast cancer research has long been an important priority of mine, as well as of my colleagues in the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. I am pleased our voices are being heard.

The Department of Defense's peer-reviewed breast cancer research program is well known,

both for its vital work in fighting this disease and its innovative and efficient use of resources. In fact, over 90 percent of program funds go directly to research grants.

The emphasis on research is crucial, for while there have been several significant advances we still know relatively little about preventing breast cancer, and treatment options are few. Unfortunately, American women still face a one in eight chance of developing breast cancer during their lifetime. With nearly 200,000 cases diagnosed last year, breast cancer is the most common form of cancer among women. In fact, it accounts for one of every three cancer diagnoses among women.

In order to make the most of recent discoveries, and to improve the lives of future generations of women, we need measures like this that invest in breast cancer research. I am also happy to note that this bill has increased funding for HIV and prostate cancer research as well.

I was especially pleased earlier this year when this Congress included my bill, the Breast Cancer Early Detection Act of 1997, in the Balanced Budget Agreement. Prior to passage of this measure, annual mammograms were covered for Medicare-eligible women between ages 50 and 65. However, after age 65 Medicare only allowed for a mammogram every other year.

This policy ran counter to the research, which has found that 80 percent of all cancer occurs in women over 50. My bipartisan bill ensured that Medicare provided coverage for annual mammograms for all women.

I applaud Congress on these wise investments. They provide hope to American women and their families, and will provide the ultimate return: saving women's lives.

Mr. HILLEARY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the National Security Subcommittee on Appropriations for his hard work during the negotiations to fight for the House's position on Bosnia.

Since November 1995, we have seen the administration break promise after promise and kick the can down the road, on a definite U.S. troop withdrawal date.

The first mission was IFOR—the implementation force; currently it is SFOR—the stabilization force; next to come is DFOR—the deterrence force.

Why just yesterday, Secretary of State Albright said "We do have a long-term interest in Bosnia—strategic as well as humanitarian."

What is next Madam Speaker, EFOR—the eternal force?

This past June, the House spoke clearly and overwhelmingly to hold the President to his June 1998 exit date—the third such date he has told the American people he would bring our troops home.

I realize the Senate did not want to take any substantive action on this important U.S. military operation.

However, I am pleased that some language was incorporated into this bill, although, it is not as strong as I would have liked.

Madam Speaker, Congress needs to regain control of the situation, and I think we come one step closer with the language included in this bill. I hope we haven't given the President too much wiggle room.

It cuts off funds for the Bosnia mission in June 1998, and forces the President to consult, certify, and provide a separate spending

vehicle to Congress to extend the mission past the withdrawal deadline.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this important Bosnia language.

Mr. COMBEST. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman and the members of the committee for appropriating \$2 million for risk-based research on the effect of toxic chemicals on human health and the environment. This funding is intended for the use by the Institute for Environmental and Human Health, which is located at Reese Air Force Base in my district. The institute was created and implemented by Texas Tech University, which has entered into a cooperative agreement with Brooks Air Force Base to provide multidisciplinary environmental research, education, public outreach, and risk assessment.

The primary focus of this institute will be the integration of environmental impact assessment and human health in the context of science-based risk assessment. The institute will provide a critical resource for the Department of Defense as it grapples with significant environmental problems at bases nationwide and abroad. The institute will enable the Department to fulfill several of its stated environmental research and risk assessment needs and goals.

In addition, the location of the institute at Reese Air Force base will play a critical role in the redevelopment of Reese Air Force Base and the economic development of the surrounding region. The \$2 million appropriation will enable Texas Tech to leverage an additional \$4 million in State funds which will be used to address the myriad of environmental concerns in west Texas and throughout the Nation.

Madam Speaker, the support of the committee is appreciated. We look forward to working in cooperation with the Department of Defense to achieve significant environmental research and assessment goals.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). 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 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 356, nays 65, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—356

Abercrombie	Bateman	Brady
Ackerman	Bentsen	Brown (FL)
Aderholt	Bereuter	Bryant
Allen	Berman	Bunning
Andrews	Bilbray	Burr
Archer	Bilirakis	Burton
Armey	Bishop	Buyer
Bachus	Blagojevich	Callahan
Baessler	Bliley	Calvert
Baker	Blunt	Camp
Baldacci	Boehlert	Canady
Ballenger	Boehner	Cannon
Barcia	Bonior	Capps
Barr	Bono	Cardin
Barrett (NE)	Borski	Carson
Bartlett	Boswell	Castle
Barton	Boucher	Chabot
Bass	Boyd	Chambliss

Christensen Hyde
Clay Inglis
Clayton Istook
Clement Jackson-Lee
Clyburn (TX)
Coble Jefferson
Coburn Jenkins
Collins John
Combest Johnson (CT)
Condit Johnson (WI)
Cook Johnson, E. B.
Cooksey Johnson, Sam
Costello Jones
Cox Kanjorski
Coyne Kaptur
Cramer Kasich
Crane Kelly
Crapo Kennedy (RI)
Cubin Kennelly
Cummings Kildee
Cunningham Kilpatrick
Danner Kim
Davis (FL) King (NY)
Davis (VA) Kingston
Deal Kleczka
DeLauro Klink
DeLay Knollenberg
Deutsch Kolbe
Diaz-Balart LaFalce
Dickey LaHood
Dicks Lampson
Dingell Lantos
Dixon Latham
Dooley LaTourette
Doolittle Lazio
Doyle Leach
Dreier Levin
Duncan Lewis (CA)
Dunn Lewis (GA)
Edwards Lewis (KY)
Ehrlich Linder
Emerson Lipinski
Engel Livingston
English Lucas
Ensign Maloney (CT)
Etheridge Maloney (NY)
Evans Manton
Everett Manzullo
Ewing Markey
Fawell Martinez
Fazio Mascara
Flake Matsui
Foley McCarthy (MO)
Forbes McCarthy (NY)
Ford McCollum
Fowler McCrery
Fox McDade
Frelinghuysen McHale
Frost McHugh
Galleghy McIntosh
Gejdenson McIntyre
Gekas McKeon
Gephardt Meehan
Gilchrest Meek
Gillmor Menendez
Gilman Metcalf
Goode Mica
Goodlatte Millender-
Goodling McDonald
Gordon Miller (FL)
Goss Mink
Graham Moakley
Granger Mollohan
Green Moran (KS)
Greenwood Moran (VA)
Gutknecht Murtha
Hall (OH) Myrick
Hall (TX) Neal
Hamilton Nethercutt
Hansen Neumann
Harman Ney
Hastert Northup
Hastings (WA) Norwood
Hayworth Nussle
Hefley Oliver
Hefner Ortiz
Herger Oxley
Hill Packard
Hilleary Pallone
Hilliard Pappas
Hobson Parker
Holden Pascrell
Horn Pastor
Hostettler Paxon
Houghton Pease
Hoyer Pelosi
Hulshof Peterson (MN)
Hunter Peterson (PA)
Hutchinson Petri

Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White

Whitfield
Wicker
Wise

Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)

Young (FL)

NAYS—65

Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berry
Blumenauer
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Chenoweth
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dellums
Doggett
Ehlers
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)

Furse
Ganske
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hookey
Jackson (IL)
Kennedy (MA)
Kind (WI)
Klug
Kucinich
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Minge
Morella

Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Paul
Payne
Ramstad
Riggs
Rivers
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Stark
Torres
Vento
Watt (NC)
Woolsey
Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Bonilla
Foglietta
Gibbons
Gonzalez

Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Largent
McInnis

Owens
Rogan
Schiff
Solomon

□ 1303

Messrs. RUSH, HINCHEY and BLUMENAUER, changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota changed their 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.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 239 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. 2267.

□ 1305

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. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Wednesday, September 24, 1997, the bill was open for amendment from page 38, line 12, through page 38, line 25.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 239, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 printed in part II of the Committee on Rules report offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE]; amendment No. 53 offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]; amendment No. 55 offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS]; amendment No. 35 offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN]; and amendment No. 32 offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HYDE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE:

Page 116, strike line 16 and all that follows through line 2 on page 117 and insert the following:

SEC. 616. ATTORNEYS FEES AND OTHER COSTS IN CERTAIN CRIMINAL CASES.

During fiscal year 1997 and in any fiscal year thereafter, the court, in any criminal case pending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall award, and the United States shall pay, to a prevailing party, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee and other litigation costs, unless the court finds that the position of the United States was substantially justified or that other special circumstances make an award unjust. Such awards shall be granted pursuant to the procedures and limitations provided for an award under section 2412 of title 28, United States Code. Fees and other expenses awarded under this provision to a party shall be paid by the agency over which the party prevails from any funds made available to the agency by appropriation. No new appropriations shall be made as a result of this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 340, noes 84, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

AYES—340

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Berry
Billbray
Billakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt

Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Carson
Castle

Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)