

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENSIGN moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 52, nays 359, answered “present” 1, not voting 21, as follows:

## [Roll No. 532]

## YEAS—52

Allen	Hastings (FL)	Millender-
Carson	Hefner	McDonald
Conyers	Hinchey	Miller (CA)
Coyne	Hoyer	Mink
DeGette	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Dellums	Jefferson	Oliver
Deutsch	Johnson (WI)	Owens
Doggett	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Ensign	Kaptur	Pastor
Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Fazio	LaFalce	Peterson (MN)
Filner	Lantos	Serrano
Ford	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Frank (MA)	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Frost	Martinez	Torres
Furse	McCarthy (NY)	Weygand
Gephardt	McDermott	Wise
Gibbons	McNulty	

## NAYS—359

Abercrombie	Bryant	Deal
Ackerman	Bunning	Delahunt
Aderholt	Burr	DeLauro
Archer	Burton	DeLay
Armey	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Bachus	Callahan	Dickey
Baesler	Calvert	Dicks
Baker	Camp	Dingell
Baldacci	Campbell	Dixon
Ballenger	Canady	Dooley
Barcia	Cannon	Doolittle
Barr	Cardin	Doyle
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Dreier
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	Duncan
Bartlett	Chambliss	Dunn
Barton	Chenoweth	Edwards
Bass	Christensen	Ehlers
Bateman	Clay	Ehrlich
Becerra	Clayton	Emerson
Bentsen	Clement	Engel
Bereuter	Clyburn	English
Berman	Coble	Etheridge
Berry	Coburn	Evans
Bilbray	Collins	Everett
Billirakis	Combest	Ewing
Bishop	Condit	Farr
Blagojevich	Cook	Fattah
Bliley	Cooksey	Fawell
Blumenauer	Costello	Flake
Blunt	Cox	Foley
Boehlert	Cramer	Forbes
Boehner	Crane	Fowler
Bonilla	Crapo	Fox
Boswell	Cummings	Franks (NJ)
Boucher	Cunningham	Frelinghuysen
Boyd	Danner	Galleghy
Brady	Davis (FL)	Ganske
Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)	Gejdenson
Brown (OH)	Davis (VA)	Gekas

Gilchrest	Manzullo	Sanchez
Gillmor	Mascara	Sanders
Gilman	Matsui	Sandlin
Goode	McCarthy (MO)	Sanford
Goodlatte	McCollum	Sawyer
Goodling	McCrery	Saxton
Gordon	McDade	Scarborough
Goss	McGovern	Schaefer, Dan
Graham	McHale	Schaffer, Bob
Green	McHugh	Scott
Greenwood	McInnis	Sensenbrenner
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Sessions
Gutknecht	McKeon	Shadegg
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Shaw
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Shays
Hamilton	Meek	Sherman
Hansen	Menendez	Shimkus
Harman	Metcalfe	Shuster
Hastert	Mica	Sisisky
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Skaggs
Hayworth	Minge	Skeen
Hefley	Moakley	Skelton
Hill	Moran (KS)	Slaughter
Hilleary	Moran (VA)	Smith (MI)
Hilliard	Morella	Smith (NJ)
Hinojosa	Murtha	Smith (OR)
Hobson	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Hoekstra	Nadler	Smith, Adam
Holden	Neal	Smith, Linda
Hooley	Nethercutt	Snowbarger
Horn	Neumann	Snyder
Hostettler	Ney	Solomon
Houghton	Northup	Souder
Hulshof	Norwood	Spence
Hutchinson	Nussle	Spratt
Hyde	Oberstar	Stabenow
Inglis	Ortiz	Stearns
Istook	Oxley	Stenholm
Jackson-Lee	Packard	Stokes
(TX)	Pappas	Strickland
Jenkins	Parker	Stump
John	Pascarell	Stupak
Johnson (CT)	Paul	Sununu
Johnson, Sam	Paxon	Talent
Jones	Pease	Tanner
Kasich	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
Kelly	Petri	Tauzin
Kennelly	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
Kildee	Pitts	Thomas
Kilpatrick	Pombo	Thompson
Kim	Pomeroy	Thornberry
Kind (WI)	Porter	Thune
King (NY)	Portman	Thurman
Kingston	Poshard	Tiahrt
Klecza	Price (NC)	Tierney
Klink	Pryce (OH)	Towns
Klug	Quinn	Trafficant
Knollenberg	Radanovich	Turner
Kolbe	Rahall	Upton
Kucinich	Ramstad	Velazquez
LaHood	Rangel	Vento
Lampson	Redmond	Visclosky
Largent	Regula	Walsh
Latham	Reyes	Wamp
LaTourette	Riggs	Waters
Lazio	Riley	Watkins
Leach	Rivers	Watt (NC)
Levin	Rodriguez	Watts (OK)
Lewis (CA)	Roemer	Waxman
Lewis (KY)	Rogan	Weldon (FL)
Linder	Rogers	Weller
Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Wexler
Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen	White
LoBiondo	Rothman	Whitfield
Lofgren	Roukema	Wicker
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
Lucas	Royce	Woolsey
Luther	Rush	Wynn
Clay	Ryun	Yates
Emerson	Sabo	Young (AK)
Engel	Salmon	Young (FL)

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

DeFazio

## NOT VOTING—21

Andrews	Foglietta	McIntosh
Bonior	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Bono	Granger	Payne
Borski	Herger	Pickett
Brown (CA)	Hunter	Schiff
Capps	Kanjorski	Schumer
Cubin	Kennedy (MA)	Weldon (PA)

## □ 1739

Messrs. SMITH of Oregon, BATEMAN, CHAMBLISS, ADAM SMITH of Washington, BARRETT of Nebraska, BARRETT of

Wisconsin and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 278 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

## H. RES. 278

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes 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 the resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ENSIGN moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

## □ 1745

## WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that time yielded to the following Members: The gentleman

from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ], the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. HOOLEY], the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] for the purpose of noticing a question of privilege not count against the one-half hour yielded to me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to proceed out of order.)

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 2267, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XXVIII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2267. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. ROHRABACHER moved that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing of votes of the House and the Senate on H.R. 2267, Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998, be instructed to insist on the House's disagreement with section 111 of the Senate amendment which provides for a permanent extension of section 245(i) of the Immigration and Nationalities Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 278 waives all points of order against the conference report accompanying H.R. 1119 and that is the fiscal 1998 defense authorization bill, the most important bill to come before this body in any given year. The rule also provides that the conference report be considered as read. This is, of course, the traditional type of rule for consideration of conference reports and will allow expedited consideration of this very vital piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the annual defense authorization bill is without question the most important bill we will consider this year. In doing our business, that sometimes seems routine, we should never lose sight of the fact that the number one duty of the Federal Government is the protection of national security, and that is exactly what this conference report is all about.

Mr. Speaker, as usual, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and their staffs have done outstanding work. I commend them and urge support for the rule so that they can get on with the business of the day.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely imperative that this bill contain adequate funding for the young men and women in uniform who are right now out in the field standing vigilant on behalf of all Americans in Bosnia, in South Korea and other parts of the world. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this bill set out policies which are consistent with and seek to maintain the unique warrior culture of the military. For without that, we cannot win wars and that is what militaries are for. No matter whether some Members like that or not. Some Members seem to have forgotten about that in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, to the best extent possible, this bill does all of that. At \$268 billion plus, the bill adds nearly 3 billion to President's Clinton's wholly inadequate request. The bill adds 3.6 billion to the President's request for procurement alone, and \$570 million for research and development over and above the President's request, and that is so very, very important because if we are going to put young men and women in uniform in harm's way, we had better put them there with the best that money can buy and research and development can obtain. These accounts contain adequate funding for the weapons systems of tomorrow such as the F-22 stealth fighter, the Marine Corps V-22 troop carrier, which is vital to the kind of rapid deployment war that we will fight in the future, and the next generation of aircraft carriers and submarines as well.

These accounts also contain funding to bring us one step closer to developing and deploying defenses against ballistic missiles, something for which Members will be grateful some day.

This conference report also contains a 2.8 percent pay raise for our military and it adds significant funding increases for barracks, for family housing, for child care centers. And, Mr. Speaker, Members should remember that years ago, when I served in the military in the United States Marine Corps, 80 percent of us were single. Today the vast majority of military personnel are married. They have families. It is absolutely imperative that they have barracks, they have family housing, and that they have child care centers so that we can expect to attract the best cross-section of America that we can.

Despite all these excellent provisions in this bill, Mr. Speaker, let me again go on record, we continue to provide inadequate, yes, inadequate funds for this Nation's defenses. This bill will represent the 13th straight year of inflation-adjusted cuts in the budget. No other large account in the Federal budget has been cut so much as the defense budget.

Our military is vastly smaller and older than just 6 years ago when we had to deploy troops in a place called the Persian Gulf. Most experts agree today that such a mission would simply be impossible if we tried to undertake it.

Of course, this is not the fault of the Committee on National Security. They have operated under severe constraints. It is also not the fault of the House Committee on National Security that this Congress, and I want everybody to listen to this, this Congress has failed to stop Communist China from securing a beachhead in this country in Long Beach, California. Members all better wake up and pay attention to that.

The House version of this bill contained a provision that would have barred the lease of the Long Beach Naval Base to Communist China's intelligence-gathering shipping company named COSCO.

But at the intense insistence of a Democrat Member of the other body, the provision has been watered down with a Presidential waiver, and we all know that President Clinton will use that waiver.

Mr. Speaker, this is a scandal of huge proportions. This Communist Government which tried to buy the 1996 election in this country may now be handed an intelligence-gathering facility on American shores. I never heard of such a thing and never believed it could happen in this Congress. What have we come to?

A bitterly ironic part of this story, Mr. Speaker, is that private groups in California may yet succeed in denying COSCO this lease through a court injunction. According to press reports, the City of Long Beach is now looking for other tenants. Is it not something that the city of Long Beach may bail us out, we, the Congress? Think about it.

Private citizens can block Communist China from securing a beachhead on American soil on environmental and historical grounds, but this United States Congress cannot stop China on national security grounds. It is truly a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, because of one or perhaps a few Members of the other body, this Congress has been disgraced. I resent it.

Despite all this, I nonetheless urge support of the rule and this conference report today. It is vital legislation, and it is simply the best we can do at this juncture. And once again, I would commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the Committee on National Security and their staffs for their excellent work on this bill.

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 the conference report on the

Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1998. This conference report provides funds essential to sustain force readiness, for the critical weapons systems and equipment that will ensure the continued superiority of the U.S. military, and for increases in pay and allowances and for other necessary quality of life improvements our men and women in uniform and for their families.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this conference report authorizes the programs that make up our military strength today and which will ensure that our forces remain second to none in the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement does take a forward look on the needs of our military in the new century. First and foremost, the conference agreement contains a 2.8 percent pay increase for the military and provides for funding for construction and improvement of troop and family housing. The agreement also contains a consolidation of housing allowances, stabilizes service members' pay for those times when service members participate in training exercises or are on deployment, and provides increases in the family separation allowance and hazardous duty incentive pay. These are all important matters that increase moral and will hopefully help retain the valuable services of men and women who serve this country in uniform.

The agreement provides funding for the acquisition of seven V-22 Osprey tiltrotor aircraft. The V-22 is designed to replace the Marine Corps' aging fleets of CH-46 helicopters and will transport Marines and their equipment into combat. The conference report provides \$2.1 billion for continued research and development and \$74.9 million for advanced procurement for the F-22 Raptor. The F-22 is the next generation air superiority fighter which is yet another system in the overall arsenal of the U.S. military which will take us into the new century in a position of power.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees have authorized \$331 million for long lead time related to the procurement of additional B-2's, or for modification and repair of the existing B-2 fleet, should the President certify Congress that additional aircraft are not needed by the Air Force. An important part of the conference agreement relating to the B-2 fleet is the requirement that the Secretary of Defense ensure that all necessary actions are taken to preserve the option to build more B-2 bombers until the panel on long-range air power, established by the fiscal year 1998 Defense Appropriations Act submits its report to Congress. I am gratified that this language will ensure that all of our options remain open while the issue of our long-range air power needs is studied.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report that deserves the support of every Member of the House.

I commend this rule providing for its consideration and urge its adoption in order that the House may proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

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

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House, I defer to the Members named in the unanimous consent agreement to give notice to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to proceed out of order.)

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas Loretta Sanchez was issued a certificate of election as the duly elected Member of Congress from the 46th District of California by the Secretary of State of California and was seated by the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1997; and

Whereas A Notice of Contest of Election was filed with the Clerk of the House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas the allegations made by Mr. Robert Dornan have been found to be largely without merit, including his charges of improper voting from a business, rather than a residential address; underage voting; double voting; and charges of unusually large numbers of individuals voting from the same address. It was found that those accused of voting from the same address included a Marines barracks and the domicile of nuns; that business addresses were legal residences for the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana Zoo; that duplicate voting was by different individuals; and that those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the privacy rights of United States citizens have been violated by the Committee's improper use of those INS records;

Whereas the INS itself has questioned the validity and accuracy of the Committee's use of INS documents;

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over five months; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight, subpoenaed the records seized by the District Attorney of Orange County on February 13, 1997 and has received and reviewed all records pertaining to registration efforts of that group; and

Whereas the Members of the House Oversight Committee are now seeking a duplicate and dilatory review of materials already in the Committee's possession by the Secretary of State of California; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California and the Committee have been reviewing these materials and have all the information they need regarding who voted in the 46th District and all the information they need to make a judgment concerning those votes; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over 9 months of review and investigation failed to produce or present any credible evidence sufficient to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is now, in place of producing such credible evidence, pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, Contestant Robert Dornan has after nearly 1 year not shown or provided any credible evidence sufficient to demonstrate that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end and now therefore be it:

Resolved, that unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its final disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

□ 1800

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Am I to understand the Speaker to say that by Thursday of this week that this resolution would be brought to the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will inform the gentleman of the scheduling within that time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Further parliamentary inquiry, is it my understanding that it can be no later than Thursday of this week, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MENENDEZ. And further parliamentary inquiry. What notice will the Member receive that the resolution will be forthcoming?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The leadership will give timely notice to the gentleman.

(Mr. BECERRA asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, Loretta Sanchez was issued a certificate of election as the duly elected Member of Congress from the 46th District of California by the Secretary of State of California and was seated by the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1997; and

Whereas A Notice of Contest of Election was filed with the Clerk of the House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California met on February 26, 1997 in Washington, D.C. on April 19, 1997 in Orange County, California and October 24, 1997 in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas the allegations made by Mr. Robert Dornan have been largely found to be without merit: charges of improper voting from a business, rather than a resident address; underage voting; double voting; and charges of unusually large number of individuals voting from the same address. It was found that voting from the same address included a Marines barracks and the domicile of nuns, that business addresses were legal residences for the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana zoo, that duplicate voting was by different individuals and those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over five months; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight, subpoenaed the records seized by the District Attorney of Orange County on February 13, 1997 and has received and reviewed all records pertaining to registration efforts of that group; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California and the Committee have been reviewing these materials and has all the information it needs regarding who voted in the 46th District and all the information it needs to make judgments concerning those votes; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over nine months of review and investigation failed to present credible evidence to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, Contestant Robert Dornan has not shown or provided credible evidence that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its final disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is

dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair's previous announcement will appear in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the Chair's prior announcement is as follows:

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within two legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, Loretta Sanchez has been duly elected to represent the 46th District of California; and

Whereas A Notice of Contest of Election was filed with the Clerk of the House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California met only on February 26, 1997 in Washington, D.C. on April 19, 1997 in Orange County, California, and October 24, 1997 in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas the allegations made by Mr. Robert Dornan have been largely found to be without merit: charges of improper voting from a business, rather than a resident address; underage voting; double voting; and charges of unusually large number of individuals voting from the same address. It was found that going from the same address included a Marines barracks and the domicile of nuns, that business addresses were legal residences for the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana zoo, that duplicate voting was by different individuals and those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over five months; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight, subpoenaed the records seized by the District Attorney of Orange County on February 13, 1997 and has received and reviewed all records pertaining to registration efforts of that group; and

Whereas some Members of the House Oversight Committee are now seeking a duplicate and dilatory review of materials already in the Committee's possession by the Secretary of State of California; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California and the Committee have been reviewing these materials and has all the information it needs regarding who voted in the 46th District and all the information it needs to make judgments concerning those votes; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over nine months of review and investigation failed to present credible evidence to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, Contestant Robert Dornan has not shown or provided credible evidence that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its final disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair's previous announcement will be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the Chair's prior announcement is as follows:

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within two legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

(Mr. CONDIT asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, Loretta Sanchez was issued a certificate of election as the elected Member of Congress from the 46th District of California and was seated by the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1997; and

Whereas A Notice of Contest of Election was filed with the Clerk of House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California met on February 26th, 1997 in Washington, D.C. on April 19th, 1997 in Orange County, California, and October 24, 1997 in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas the Committee on the House Oversight has issued unprecedented

subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over five months; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over nine months of review and investigation failed to present credible evidence to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, the Committee on the House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring the matter forward for the House of Representatives to vote upon: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its final disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair's previous announcement will appear in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the Chair's prior announcement is as follows:

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within two legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONNIT] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, Loretta Sanchez was issued a certificate of election as the duly elected Member of Congress from the 46th District of California by the Secretary of State of California and was seated by the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1997; and

Whereas A Notice of Contest of Election was filed with the Clerk of the House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California has met only on February 26, 1997 in Washington, D.C. on April 19, 1997 in Orange County, California, and October 24, 1997 in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas the allegations made by Mr. Robert Dornan have been largely found to be

without merit: charges of improper voting from a business, rather than a resident address; underage voting; double voting; and charges of unusually large number of individuals voting from the same address. It was found that voting from the same address included a Marines barracks and the domicile of nuns, that business addresses were legal residences for the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana zoo, that duplicate voting was by different individuals and those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over five months; and

Whereas some Members of the House Oversight Committee are now seeking a duplicate and dilatory review of materials already in the Committee's possession by the Secretary of State of California; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California and the Committee have been reviewing these materials and has all the information it needs regarding who voted in the 46th District and all the information it needs to make judgments concerning those votes; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over nine months of review and investigation failed to present credible evidence to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, Contestant Robert Dornan has not shown or provided credible evidence that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end: Now, there, be it

*Resolved*, That unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its final disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair's previous announcement will appear in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the Chair's prior announcement is as follows:

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within two legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 1815

(By unanimous consent, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, Loretta Sanchez was issued a certificate of election as a duly elected Member of Congress from the 46th District of California and was seated by the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1997; and

Whereas a Notice of Contest of Election was filed with the Clerk of the House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California met on February 26, 1997 in Washington, D.C., on April 19, 1997 in Orange County, California, and October 24, 1997 in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas the allegations made by Mr. Robert Dornan have been largely found to be without merit: charges of improper voting from a business, rather than a resident address; underage voting; double voting; and charges of unusually large number of individuals voting from the same address. It was found that voting from the same address included a Marines barracks and the domicile of nuns, that business addresses were legal residences for the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana zoo, that duplicate voting was by different individuals and those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over 5 months; and

Whereas some Members of the House Oversight Committee are now seeking a duplicate and dilatory review of materials already in the Committee's possession by the Secretary of State of California; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California and the Committee have been reviewing these materials and has all the information it needs regarding who voted in the 46th District and all the information it needs to make judgments concerning these votes; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over nine months of review and investigation failed to present credible evidence to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, Contestant Robert Dornan has not shown or provided credible evidence that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end and now therefore be it;

Resolved, that unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair's previous announcement will appear in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the Chair's prior announcement is as follows:

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. HOOLEY] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WATERS was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, a contested election contest has been pending between Congresswoman Loretta Sanchez and Mr. Robert Dornan since December 26, 1997; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California has only met on February 26, 1997 and October 24, 1997 in Washington, D.C., and on April 19, 1997 in Orange County, California; and

Whereas the allegations made by Mr. Robert Dornan have been largely found to be without merit: charges of improper voting from a business rather than a residence address; underage voting; double voting; and charges of unusually large number of individuals voting from the same address. It was found that voting from the same address included a Marines barracks and the domicile of nuns, that business addresses were legal residences for the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana zoo, that duplicate voting was by different individuals and those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over 5 months; and

Whereas some Members of the House Oversight Committee are now seeking a duplicate and dilatory review of materials already in the Committee's possession by the Secretary of State of California; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California and the Committee have been reviewing these materials and has all the information it needs regarding who voted in the 46th District and all the information it needs to make judgments concerning those votes; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over 9 months of review and investigation failed to present credible evidence to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, Contestant Robert Dornan has not shown or provided credible evidence that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end and now therefore be it;

Resolved, that unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its final disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair's previous announcement will appear in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the Chair's prior announcement is as follows:

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, Loretta Sanchez was issued a certificate of election as the duly elected Member of Congress from the 46th District of California by the Secretary of State of California and was seated by the U.S. House of Representatives on January 7, 1997; and

Whereas a Notice of Contest of Election was filed with the Clerk of the House by Mr. Robert Dornan on December 26, 1996; and

Whereas the Task Force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California has met only three times; and

Whereas the allegations made by Mr. Robert Dornan have been largely found to be without merit: charges of improper voting from a business, rather than a resident address; underage voting; double voting; and charges of unusually large number of individuals voting from the same address. It was

found that voting from the same address included a Marines barracks and the domicile of nuns, that business addresses were the legal residences of the individuals, including the zoo keeper of the Santa Ana zoo, that duplicate voting was by different individuals and those accused of underage voting were of age; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has issued unprecedented subpoenas to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to compare their records with Orange County voter registration records, the first time in any election in the history of the United States that the INS has been asked by Congress to verify the citizenship of voters; and

Whereas the INS has complied with the Committee's request and, at the Committee's request, has been doing a manual check of its paper files and providing worksheets containing supplemental information on that manual check to the Committee on House Oversight for over 5 months; and

Whereas some Members of the House Oversight Committee are now seeking a duplicate and dilatory review of materials already in the Committee's possession by the Secretary of State of California; and

Whereas the Task force on the Contested Election in the 46th District of California and the Committee have been reviewing these materials and has all the information it needs regarding who voted in the 46th District and all the information it needs to make judgment concerning those votes; and

Whereas the Committee on House Oversight has after over 9 months of review and investigation failed to present credible evidence to change the outcome of the election of Congresswoman Sanchez and is pursuing never ending and unsubstantiated areas of review; and

Whereas, Contestant Robert Dornan has not shown or provided credible evidence that the outcome of the election is other than Congresswoman Sanchez's election to the Congress; and

Whereas, the Committee on House Oversight should complete its review of this matter and bring this contest to an end and now therefore be it;

Resolved, that unless the Committee on House Oversight has sooner reported a recommendation for its final disposition, the contest in the 46th District of California is dismissed upon the expiration of October 31, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair's previous announcement will appear in the RECORD at this point.

There was no objection.

The text of the Chair's prior announcement is as follows:

Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Westerville, Ohio [Mr. KASICH], who a number of years ago came to this body. He has since proven himself to be one

of the most respected and distinguished Members. As a matter of fact, I can only recall disagreeing with him one time. It was on a little airplane, but beyond that, he has always been right.

Mr. KASICH. A little airplane that cost \$2 billion apiece, but nevertheless.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed the conferees did not reflect the clear will of the House in the conference report's provision dealing with Bosnia. The mission of the U.S. Armed Forces in Bosnia has been characterized by a failure to define achievable objectives, a unilateral shifting of deadlines and a refusal on the part of the administration to clearly explain its goals either to Congress or to the public at large. If the American people are to have any confidence in our national security policy, that policy must be honestly and forthrightly presented to them.

I am troubled by the unclear focus of the mission and the apparent lack of an exit strategy. The underlying premise of the original mission was to separate the warring parties, then turn the peacekeeping role over to our European allies within one year.

In November of 1995, in his address to the Nation regarding our proposed commitment of forces to Bosnia, President Clinton said that our participation should last about one year. However, in November of 1996, the President announced that our military presence in Bosnia would be extended for another 18 months, until June 30 of 1998.

Secretary of Defense Cohen has emphatically stated his understanding that U.S. forces would be withdrawn by the end of June of 1998. However, on September 23 of this year, National Security Adviser Berger cast serious doubt on this second deadline.

It was against this background on June 24, 1997, that the House voted in overwhelming numbers to prohibit funding for U.S. ground forces in Bosnia after June of 1998. This strong show of support for setting a date certain for withdrawal came just after the House rejected an amendment to withdraw our forces by December 31, 1997. Together, these votes demonstrated the consensus in the House that we should wrap up our Bosnia deployment.

The conferees' decision to abandon a firm withdrawal date in favor of language merely requiring presidential certifications for the Bosnia mission to be extended for an indefinite period of time after June 30, 1998; in other words, there is no limit, we have accepted a much weaker position, not only weakens the House position but it offers further scope for yet another extension of the Bosnia mission.

It is a generally accepted premise that the President is the sole organ of the Federal Government in the field of international relations and that Congress generally accepts a broad scope for independent executive action in international affairs.

□ 1830

But Congress has long been concerned about U.S. military commit-

ments and security arrangements that have been made by the President unilaterally, without the consent or full knowledge of Congress.

Throughout our Nation's history, prior Presidents have sought Congressional consent for extended deployments of the United States Armed Forces overseas, either through declarations of war or by acts of Congress authorizing specific deployment.

Article I of the Constitution grants Congress the sole authority to declare war. These powers were explicitly given to Congress in order to prevent the President, in his role as Commander in Chief, from using the Armed Forces for purposes that have not been approved of by Congress on behalf of the national security interests of the American people.

Nowhere in the Constitution is the President empowered to deploy U.S. Armed Forces for war or beyond our borders without the consent of Congress. It is generally agreed, however, that situations of imminent or immediate danger to American life or property may arise that would give the President the power to act without previous Congressional consent. But the extended deployment to Bosnia hardly qualifies for such unilateral action.

President Clinton, by ordering the deployment of our military into Bosnia without the consent of Congress, has assumed that the making of war is the prerogative of the executive branch. But the raising, maintenance, governance and regulation of the deployment and use of the Armed Forces of the United States is the prerogative of Congress.

Not only does the conferees' weakening of the House position undercut Congress' legitimate authority to work its will on a vital foreign policy matter that involves the commitment of substantial U.S. military forces, it comes precisely at a time when the international organization, the international force, is clearly drifting deeper into the quagmire in the Balkans, rather than preparing to disengage from it.

During the last three months, that force has become more and more entangled in efforts at nation building, a flawed objective as well as an inappropriate use of combat forces. For example, those troops are increasingly becoming involved in Serbian interparty politics, the takeover of police stations and the censorship of television broadcasts. These recent actions compromise our status as neutral peacekeepers and jeopardize the primary mission of separating the former belligerents. More important, they endanger American lives in much the same way as our poorly-thought-out policies in Somalia and Lebanon.

The administration has compounded the difficulty of a confused, evolving mission in Bosnia by the lack of a clear exit strategy. When Henry Shelton testified in the Senate during his confirmation hearing, General Shelton ad-

mitted he had not been informed about the exit strategy for Bosnia. It is likely that to the extent an exit strategy exists, it is so firmly tied to hazily defined future political events that there is always sufficient reason to leave U.S. troops in place.

Finally, our mission in Bosnia raises troubling questions about allied burden sharing. The bottom line on the burden sharing is this is in the vital interests of Europe, but is not really the vital direct interests of the United States, and it does not follow that U.S. ground troops must be tied up there for years. If the Europeans truly have the will to maintain peace in Bosnia, they will find a way, and the administration should press the Europeans to begin planning now.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, if the President of the United States attempts to extend the mission in Bosnia beyond June of 1998, I will come to the House floor and do everything I can to work with the chairman of the Committee on Rules to end that deployment. This is a mission with no clear objective, no exit strategy, and no reasonable goal of accomplishing a mission. Frankly, it is difficult to know what the mission is because the administration has never defined it. This is a prescription for failure and a risking of the lives of U.S. men and women in Bosnia. The President should get us out.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purposes of agreeing with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and commending him for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am the vice president of the North Atlantic Assembly, the parliamentary arm of NATO. At a NATO meeting just 2 weeks ago, I informed our 15 other NATO allies that by June 1998, we will have been in Bosnia for 2½ years; that this was not going to turn into another Vietnam; that we were not going to continue to leave our troops there indefinitely at great expense to our military budget; and that the NATO allies had better begin to make plans to solve a European problem, a European problem being a civil strife within sovereign boundaries of a country, and that NATO should not be there trying to solve civil matters, trying to be peace-makers.

So I just wanted to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for his statement. We will speak to this further. We have spoken to it twice already on the floor of this Congress, and we will speak to it again in the months to come, that those troops must come out of there no later than June 1998.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member on the Committee on National Security.

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



Mr. Speaker, first, this is a very straightforward rule, one hour of debate on the conference report. I have no problem with the rule. Secondly, I would like to say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] that there is a different perspective and point of view on Bosnia. This obviously is not the time nor the place for us to engage in substantive debate on that matter.

With the balance of the time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, for the purposes of colloquy, engage the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

There is considerable concern, I would like to say to my distinguished colleague from Colorado, at both the local level and the Federal level, that the environmental cleanup proposed by the Department of the Army for the Presidio in San Francisco will not meet the environmental health and safety criteria appropriate for a national park.

The Presidio, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is the only base closure to convert to national park use, and it is important for the Army to meet the cleanup levels set by the National Park Service.

I would encourage the committee to work with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] in urging the Department of the Army to expedite its environmental remediation efforts at the Presidio. This is a clear case where there should be an accelerated cleanup that meets the requirements of the national park to ensure the public health and safety of the millions of visitors there.

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

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns that my colleague has raised and will work with the committee, and with him, and with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] to ensure an appropriate cleanup for the Presidio.

We have this problem with a number of bases around the country, but I think this one has a unique factor connected with it. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has pointed out what that factor is, and that is that this is a national park. We want to move forward in creating this, and, if we are going to do this, we want it to be a good national park. We cannot do that without the cleanup.

I share the gentleman's concerns and will do everything I can to work with him and solve this problem.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful remarks and response. I would just like to further for the record make the following comment.

Significant philanthropic efforts are under way at the Presidio where sizeable pledges have been made to the National Park Service. In addition to the

potential threat to philanthropic interests, it would be difficult for the Presidio Trust to meet its self-sufficiency requirements without a timely and thorough cleanup of the Presidio. Securing the leases necessary to generate revenues is essential to the success of the trust, and can only be accomplished if the cleanup is timely and thorough.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado for his final remarks.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has raised very important concerns, ones which have also been voiced by the Committee on Appropriations in two of its measures. We will work together to resolve these questions to ensure the success of the Presidio.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think this has been an important colloquy.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RODRIGUEZ], a member of the committee.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that this is no compromise. It is like someone stealing your wallet and then offering only to return a few dollars. The bottom line is, this is not an appropriate agreement we can deal with.

The language in this bill prevents fair competition for Defense Department maintenance work. This means higher costs for U.S. taxpayers. I repeat, the depot language in this bill will cost the taxpayers money.

We just completed a competition for work done at Kelly Air Force Base. Warner-Robins Air Force Base in Georgia won the contract, at a savings of \$190 million. The language in this bill would prevent us from seeing such savings in the future.

Without the ability to conduct a fair public-private competition, the Air Force and Defense Department will not be able to fund the modernization program needed for our military to remain superior. Whether one thinks we should be spending additional money or not for national defense, everyone should agree that we should use every dollar most effectively.

The language in this bill is to the contrary. It makes public-private competition next to impossible. Supporters of the language freely and proudly admit that it will make it too expensive and too restrictive for the private contractors to bid on depot work at San Antonio and Sacramento. The deck is stacked against free competition and against the U.S. taxpayer and military modernization.

It should come as no surprise that the most punitive restrictions fall on the competition workload at the closing depots in San Antonio and Sacramento. Private bidders must comply with arcane rules not imposed on the public bidders, so we do not have a level playing field.

The Depot Caucus believes this work should go to the depots, regardless of cost and regardless of what the Defense Department needs. They are protecting their home turf, and I respect that, but it is also bad policy, and this is not what we should be supporting. It puts our troops at a disadvantage.

The Secretary of Defense and his military commanders need the flexibility on the current law to modernize. To do so, they need to have the ability to take the best and most appropriate public or private bid.

Let us not tie the Pentagon's hands with a requirement on design, because, at the end, it is only to protect the existing bases that are there now. It will be at the expense of modernization and at the expense of readiness. A vote against the defense authorization bill is a vote for competition and for the future of our military readiness.

Mr. Speaker, there is also evidence in the newspapers by some individuals indicating that on the contracts that are out there, "Contractors will have to include in their bids millions of dollars of costs that were previously required." I think this will make it unlikely that the contractor will even bid.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me interrupt this debate to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS] chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 858, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. GOSS submitted the following conference report and statement on the Senate bill (S. 858) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes:

##### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 105-350)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 858), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.