Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, can I count on the Speaker to enforce the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will abide by the rule. When addressing the Chair they must remove their badges.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 889, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material therein.

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

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 92 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 889.

□ 1304

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, with Mr. THOMAS of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, on Friday, February 10, the House Committee on Appropriations ordered reported two bills: H.R. 889, a bill providing for emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense; and H.R. 845, a depleted by actions taken in support of unbudgeted contingency operations in Haiti, Somalia, Southwest Asia, Bosnia, Korea, and refugee support in the Caribbean. Without these reimbursements, defense readiness will suffer severe and immediate impacts. These necessary appropriations are partially offset by rescissions within the Department of Defense totaling $1.460 billion. The remainder of the offsets, $1.4 billion that are necessary in order to make the entire package budget authority neutral come from rescissions in H.R. 845, in foreign aid programs and low priority discretionary domestic programs.

I want all my colleagues to understand that it is the policy of the Republican leadership to pay for all supplemental whether they are emergencies or not. We're doing that. The reason the committee developed two bills is that in order to pay for the offset shortfall of the Defense supplementals of $1.4 billion, we reported a companion rescission bill of like amount.

I also want to eliminate any confusion at this point. The rescission bill we are considering today is not the rescission bill I have been talking about since January. Development of that bill is on track. In fact, five subcommittees are meeting this very day to report out their rescissions. We expect to have the bill on the floor in early March. The rescissions we are considering today is just a slice of that bill—in order to pay for the Defense supplemental.

The rescissions were developed in a manner that tried to minimize the number of accounts. In order to do this we sought activities that had larger dollar amounts available for rescission. These activities can be grouped into four categories:

The first is: Low priority defense and international programs, including $110 million for the Russian Army Officer Resettlement Program, which has been deemed an unnecessary expensive program; $100 million of atomic energy waste cleanup, funds that are not needed this year; $70 million from the Emergency Immigration Fund, monies available for reduction because of a lack of Haitian and Cuba refugees; and $62 million from the African Development Fund, monies that can't be spent because our government hasn't begun replenishment negotiations.

The second category is low priority domestic programs, including the following: A $200 million youth training program that doesn't work and which even President Clinton wants to cut in fiscal year 1996; a $100 million school velopment program for the Penn Station in New York City; and another unauthorized $400 million wind tunnel program for NASA.

Finally, in the fourth category we scaled back a Presidential increase of $107 million for the National Institute of Standards Industrial Technology Program. This will still leave an increase of $125,000,000 for that program in fiscal year 1995.

In order to explain a few points that I hope our colleagues will keep in mind as we proceed to consider the two bills now merged into one, let me explain the following:

First, it is the leadership's desire that all supplemental funds, even emergencies, be paid for completely. Our approach again does just that.

□ 1310

Second, as the distinguished chairman of the National Security Subcommittee will point out, we have made significant cuts in wasteful nonproductive Department of Defense programs, and we cannot in good conscience go further.

In fact, the President has just sent to this Congress a defense budget that represents a real decline in defense for the 11th straight year, representing a 71-percent cut in procurement of new weapons systems over those 11 years.

This policy is now directly threatening the safety and lives of our young men and women who need our support to defend our country. Although I personally opposed some of the questionable military ventures in Haiti and Somalia and Rwanda and other places that depleted these funds, the fact is that the money has been spent, and we must pay the bills.

That means that we must move this bill through the Congress by the end of March to avert a readiness crisis at the Pentagon.

Mr. Chairman, as you can see, the two bills that were developed in committee are not intimately linked together, and I urge their adoption and the passage of this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has consumed 6 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is really where the rubber hits the road for those Members who have told their constituents that they want to support a balanced budget and for those Members who have voted for a constitutional amendment on a balanced budget.

burse DOD for the costs that it incurred in operations such as Haiti and hold the line on the deficit is to vote for the Obey amendment which will be offered at the end of an hour on general debate.

Let me walk Members through the numbers so they understand what is going on, because it is fairly complicated.

The administration, before the balanced budget amendment was passed, sent down a request to spend $2.5 billion to replenish Pentagon accounts, and they offset that with $700 million in suggested cuts, leaving a deficit of $1.8. billion.

Then the appropriations subcommittee, when they marked up the bill, added $670 million in what they considered to be high-priority items. They added a similar amount in rescissions so they, too, came to the House with a bill which was adding $1.8 billion to the deficit, minus $400 million which was an adjustment that CBO provided both the administration's approach and the committee approach, which left each proposal with a $1.4 billion deficit.

So then to try to deal with the fact, the committee produced a second trailer rescission bill, which purported to cut $1.4 billion in spending but instead of taking that our of Pentagon programs, they took it out of nondefense programs.

The problem is that that was a separate bill. It was not going to go anywhere in the Senate. Everybody understood that and so the committee, wisely, finally faced reality and at least in a small concession to reality voted on the rule to merge both bills so that at least they were more credible in pretending that the bill was paid for.

But I would point out to my colleagues, if you campaigned and told your people, I am going to cut budget authority, then go ahead and vote for this bill without my amendment. But if you told your people, I am going to cut the deficit, then you have absolutely no choice but to vote for the Obey amendment. Because if you do not, you will be, by your vote, adding $300 million to the deficit this year and $644 million over 5 years.

The reason I say that is because while we are talking about budget authority, the deficit is measured only by what we actually spend, not what we authorize down the line but what we actually spend in any fiscal period. And that is determined only on the outlay side.

So if you do not vote for the Obey amendment, you will be going home and having to explain to your folds that you needed to actually balance this baby out, instead what you did is, you said, well, they ought to go after some other domestic programs.

I would point out that virtually every appropriations subcommittee is today marking up and tomorrow will be marking up on bills which will cut $14 billion out of this year's spending on the domestic side of the ledger. It seems to me that any domestic cuts which are being made in this bill, it seems to me that given the fact you have got $14 billion more in cuts in very important programs that affect your home towns, it seems to me that what you ought to be doing is taking the domestic cuts which are provided for in this bill and using those on the domestic side of the ledger, on those rescissions so you ease the squeeze on other programs for working families. That is what you would also be doing if you voted for the Obey amendment.

So what my amendment will do, when we get a chance to offer it, is to simply strip away all of the add-ons that the committee made on both the spending side and the rescission side and simply give the Defense Department the authority to simply scrub their budget to find $2.5 billion in low priority, nonreadiness, nonquality of life issues or areas. So if they want to dig into their budget and find $2.5 billion of pork to pay for it, they can, without damaging domestic programs and without damaging key defense programs.

It seems to me, if you want to go home with a straight face and say that you did not meet yourself coming back on the very first financial vote that you cast after you posed for political holy pictures and voted for the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, it seems to me that if you want to measure up to that political promise you made when you voted for that resolution, you will vote for the Obey amendment. If you do not, pure and simple, you will be adding almost $300 million to the deficit this year, almost $700 million to the deficit over 5 years.

And regardless of the way anybody tries to fancy talk their way out of it, that is a fact. CBO says it is a fact. Everybody who scores us says it is a fact. And you know it is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

were several things that I asked him to agree to, which he agreed to. But we have a good, bipartisan national defense bill here today. That is what we are talking about, is national defense.

Why are we here today? We are here today because the President, over fiscal years 1994–95, has sent troops to Bosnia, has sent troops to Somalia twice, to the area of Korea, to the southwest Asian area, to Rwanda, to perform refugee interdiction off Cuba, and Haiti. And at one time, these contingency operations have involved approximately 100,000 American troops in deployments that were not planned and not paid for.

□ 1320

Where did the money come from, then, to pay for these contingencies? It came from the fourth quarter operations and maintenance and training accounts of all of the military services.

What does that mean? It means that by March 31, and this is according to the Pentagon and the Department of Defense, as of March 31 if the money has not been replaced that was spent for these contingencies that most of us were not even consulted about, that fourth quarter training is going to be degraded. The word ''degraded'' came from General Shalikashvili, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs.

He made that point in a public hearing, that training in the fourth quarter will be seriously degraded if we do not return this money. That is what we are here for.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee added some additional readiness enhancements. We identified about $2 billion worth of similar readiness requirements that had not been provided for in anybody's request, except the field commanders and the war-fighting military.

We looked through that list and picked out $670 million that we added to this emergency readiness package.

Mr. Chairman, what is the biggest part of that additional readiness package? It is salary increases for the soldiers and the sailors and the Marines and the airmen and the airwomen and all of those who serve in the military, whether they are in the continental United States or whether they are deployed somewhere overseas on a permanent basis, or whether they are part of these contingency operations; a pay increase that this Congress required but did not provide the necessary money to fully fund. That is the biggest item in the enhancement package that we added on.

defense today is going to be one of the easiest appropriation votes Members are going to have this year, because there are going to be a lot of cutting amendments.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, we came up with a rescission package that we took from nonessential items that were paid for through the defense budget that really did not add a whole lot to our national defense.

Therefore, we bring to the Members a bill, and despite all the arguments about budget authority or budget outlays or CBO numbers here and CBO numbers there, I am not really into the politics of this. I am not really into the juggling of the numbers to make something appear to be something that it is not.

I am here to provide for the strongest national defense possible for the least amount of money; in other words, squeezing to get as much as we can out of the defense dollar. That is what this bill does. We are setting a new precedent with this bill, and we are making history today, because we are for the first time paying for this supplemental appropriations bill, despite the fact that it is an emergency.

Someone just asked me out in the Speaker's lobby, ''You guys are spending for this and spending for that.'' Back up. We guys did not spend this money. We had no part of the decision in spending this money. The President of the United States decided to go to these various contingencies. He spent the money.

From a political standpoint, we could have just sat back and waited for him to send his budget request. We could have sat on it for weeks or months. That would have been very irresponsible for us to do, because this money is necessary by March 31 or we are going to stand down flying hours.

Red Flag, Members all know about Red Flag and Top Gun. Would it not be a shame to close down these training activities, and they would be closed down, if we do not provide this money? Red Flag and Top Gun are the best experience that a combat pilot will ever have, other than going into actual combat. Members can talk to any pilot anywhere in the world that has ever gone to Top Gun or Red Flag, and they will tell us that, that this is what prepares them to be superior in the air.

Would it not be a shame for us to delay this bill and have to cancel Red Flag or Top Gun? Would it not be a shame that we do not have enough money for flying time and spare parts to keep the airplanes going so that our flyers and or pilots can stay proficient has been suggested and hinted that maybe there were some pet projects in here, maybe we did something for some Congressmen that is buried that would be helpful to that Congressman or Congresswoman personally, politically, back in their districts.

There is nothing in this bill to provide a special interest project of any kind to any member of the Congress, to any defense contractor, to any special interest. There is no money in here for that. These monies are directed to the U.S. Department of Defense for training, for operations, for maintenance, for spare parts, for keeping airplanes and ships and guns and tanks and everything ready to use and ready to be used for training. It brings back our accounts that are being sorely depleted. This is readiness at its best.

Mr. Chairman, when I talk about readiness, it is important, because some of these programs are down the road. It is important to note, and one of the very distinguished generals who testified just this week before our subcommittee made the point ''There is more to readiness than just readiness. There is immediate readiness, there is midterm readiness, and there is long-term readiness. If we do not do the things today to prepare us for midterm and long-term readiness, we are going to be in serious trouble.''

Members all know the story about the three Army divisions that were rated C–3, which is considerably below the readiness rating that we would like them to have. Our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [FLOYD SPENCE], made this notation in a public statement.

It was argued at the Pentagon that that was not true, but finally they came back and admitted, yes, it was true. We just cannot afford to let our military be affected in this way.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. Put aside the arguments over politics, or who got to offer an amendment and who did not get to offer an amendment. Remember, this is just part of the procedure. We have to go to the other body. They have to go to the subcommittee, their full committee, to the floor. We have to go to conference.

We need to expedite this activity. I ask that Members pay close attention to the debate that follows as to the seriousness of this national defense readiness bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out that all of the projects that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] indicated ought to proceed will There is not. The pay raise was provided last year. The military personnel will get that pay raise whether the Obey amendment passes or whether it does not. That is a red herring. The only question is where are we going to get the money for the remainder of the pay raise.

If we pass the Obey amendment, we will get it out of pork that Congress put in the DOD bill. If we do not pass the Obey amendment, we will have to cut into domestic programs in order to finance it. I think the choice is clear.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, Mr. OBEY. Mr. OBEY's amendment keeps the books clean. It provides only what the administration asked for and pays for it.

Mr. Chairman, on January 26, 1995, the House of Representatives passed a resolution to make balancing this Nation's budget a constitutional mandate.

Once ratified, the balanced budget amendment will take its place along side the right to free speech, the right to vote, freedom of religion, and the abolition of slavery.

The Members of this House considered a balanced budget so fundamental that they flocked to the floor to support it.

I supported the balanced budget amendment, because I want the budget balanced. I have urged my colleagues not to use the balanced budget amendment to give the appearance of good fiscal policy, while, in reality pushing the hard choices off until the next century.

Today, less than a month later, the balanced budget amendment will get its first at bat. If the House fails to enact the Obey amendment, the balanced budget amendment will be zero for 1 so far this season, not even good enough for a replacement player.

We will raise this Nation's deficit by $645 million by the year 2000, just 2 years before the balanced budget amendment kicks in.

This legislation we consider today contains $3.2 billion in new spending, $2.53 billion in emergency funds the Clinton administration requested, and $670 million of Republic add-ons. Despite a promise to the contrary and despite their best efforts, the Republican majority has failed to pay for all this new spending. All told, this borrow and

est in the next 2 years alone for the new defense spending they refuse to pay for today.

Clearly the most disturbing aspect of today's debate is what it means for the rest of this Congress. In the next couple of weeks we are going to have to come up with an additional $15 billion in rescissions—this year's share of the Contract on America and the California flood relief bill.

If this Congress doesn't have the intestinal fortitude to come up with $3 billion in cuts—balanced budget amendment or not—how are we possibly gong to come up with $15 billion?

Mr. Chairman, this legislation makes a sham of the balanced budget amendment, and it deceives the American people. It is a relapse back into a terrible habit I thought we would finally overcome, that of sending our children the bill for our own failed leadership.

I urge my colleagues, support the balanced budget amendment. Support the Obey amendment.

□ 1330

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] who I know worked so hard to put this together.

Mr. Chairman, this really is an emergency supplemental. We use the term ''emergency'' many times, but this really is an emergency. Those of us on the Committee on Armed Services just had the Joint Chiefs of Staff in front of us a few minutes ago, and we asked the chiefs what would happen in terms of training and readiness if we did not pass this thing. General Sullivan, Chief of Staff of the Army, said, ''Readiness will drop off the table.''

He expanded on that by saying all training, all army training will cease May 31. He furthered that by saying he would have to stop the purchase of spare parts. The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Mundy, said under this new policy of going around the world, as the chairman has pointed out, exercised by the Clinton administration, the Marine Corps has increased what is known as personnel tempo. That means whipping personnel around the world, a few days back at home, then back out in the field, by 300 percent over what it was during the cold war.

This is an absolute emergency to get this money in. Let me just say as a

the ammunition, the spare parts and the maintenance for the young men and women who operate this military, vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, a couple of things I wanted to mention about the seriousness of this legislation. All of us take credit for the number of jobs that have been reduced in the Federal Government. Out of the 150,000 jobs that will have been reduced over a 3- or 4-year period, 80 percent of those jobs came from defense, active and civilian side. Fifteen percent of the budget is defense today, defense-related. In 1960, 50 percent of the budget, or the money that we spent in the Federal Government, was for defense. It is 4 percent of the GDP. That is the lowest level of spending in history. And when somebody gets up and says you can take just a small percentage out of defense and, for instance, I have to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and I normally agree that these things should not be offset. He feels strongly now because it is coming out of domestic. I do not think it ought to be offset because it is an emergency and we cannot afford to take this out of defense, and I hope in the end we will be able to work this out.

We can no longer afford to pay for these operations out of the hide of the Defense Department, because all we do is reduce readiness. All these deployments, some were agreed to, some were not agreed to, by the Congress. Some were advocated by the Congress, some were not. The President has every right to deploy troops in an emergency situation, in a national security situation. I have urged every White House over the years to consult with Congress when it is for humanitarian deployment so that we will know what the cost is and how we are going to pay for it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] and I last year worked with the national security adviser, and we came up with language that said the White House will confer with Congress before they make humanitarian deployments. No President likes to do that.

I remember when Secretary Weinberger came before the Congress, and you could not ask him one question because if you had 5 minutes, your 5 minutes were gone. I would say to him, ''You can't reduce taxes, increase defense and balance the budget, because

ture. And anything we take out of defense hurts readiness. It hurts quality of life.

I went down to Fort Campbell. Sixty percent of the children going to school on the base needed some kind of supplement from the Federal Government. They were living and had to have some sort of help to pay for their meals.

We have got a backlog of real property maintenance of $12 billion, and depot maintenance of $2 billion. So anybody who thinks there is an excess of money in the Defense Department does not understand how the system works. In the end we will have another reprogramming, we will have all kinds of changes made in the amount of money the Defense Department has. It is absolutely essential they get this legislation as quickly as possible so we can go to conference and get the whole thing worked out.

I would urge the Members to support this supplemental.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this supplemental appropriations bill for defense, paid for through various rescissions.

Let me just give a brief history of one interest I have in this bill, that is, the aid to build new homes for Russian soldiers because their governors contended that they could not move them out of the Baltics without a place to live.

So we concocted, or at least the administration did, concocted a program where the United States of America would pay for their housing.

Let me further refresh your mind and tell you that President Yeltsin and President Clinton met, first in Vancouver, and then in Tokyo, and the devised this plan where the United States of America would give them about $160 million to build new homes. Why? Because they said there was no place for them to live, no existing available homes:

We were insisting that the Russians get out of the Baltics, and the President, rightfully, so, was questioning Mr. Yeltsin about that. ''Let's get these troops out of the Baltics, let's get them back to Russia.''

Mr. Yeltsin says, ''We don't have any homes for them to live in.''

and now are giving Russian officers $25,000 each to buy an existing home.

Now, since they contended the existing homes were not available, the Russians either misled us and told us an untruth. I should think that they were erroneous and not lying to us, but, nevertheless, that is where we are.

Included in this bill is a provision to rescind $100 million of that money that was an asinine program to begin with and is even more asinine today. Because, No. 1, we cannot afford it. And, No. 2, I do not know why we should give a golden parachute to Russian military retirees, and I do not know why we should be building new homes when now existing homes are available.

This is a very small part of this rescission package, but it is a very important, a very symbolic message that we must send to the American people.

□ 1340

I serve on the Military Construction Subcommittee, and the Defense Department is telling us that they desperately need moneys for 77,000 of our own active military people in order that they can have decent housing, and we are telling them that we do not have the money.

How can we tell them that and at the same time tell the Russians, well, you people served well, come on back to Russia and we are going to give you a voucher for $25,000. This is just one good reason to support this bill and I urge Members to support it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like just to point out several things about the rescission of the money for the housing for the Russian officers.

No. 1, this was a clear-cut deal that was made between the President of the United States and Boris Yeltsin in Vancouver. The deal was, the agreement America signed on to was if you will take your soldiers out of the Baltics we will assist in furnishing housing for the officers. That was not only a deal made by the President of the United States but it was then validated by the Congress, and by this rescission we are pretty well telling the Russians that it is very difficult to make a deal with the United States which the United States will keep, because the Russians then did withdraw their troops from the Baltics and now we are withdrawing our part of the agreement.

will cost $65 million of the $105 million just to abrogate those contracts before the lawsuits are filed.

This is a very bad idea. It is America reneging on its word. It is provocation to the Red Army and furthermore it is not going to save a penny.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 889. Not only does this measure falsely proclaim to be budget neutral by virtue of offsets contained in a companion bill, H.R. 845, it provides moneys not requested by the Defense Department and not related to any new costs for unplanned defense operations. These moneys are provided by cutting other important domestic programs.

Let me clarify that I am not in opposition to our fulfilling critical obligations to defense responsibilities we maintain as a result of continuing activities around the world. I support this administration's efforts to fulfill these responsibilities. I do not, however, support unfair and unnecessary reductions to domestic programs—to the sum of $1.4 billion—to fund other defense programs that could be funded from dollars already available to that agency.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we are making these cuts and misleading the American public to believe that they offset the defense supplemental. In fact, in terms of the actual spending that will result from this supplemental, the offsets fall far short. Both in fiscal year 1995 and over the next 5 years, 5-year spending by the supplemental will be nearly $650 million more than the 5-year savings from the offsets provided from cutting these domestic programs.

Mr. Chairman, among the programs slated for cuts are critical training programs for our Nation's youth. Moneys to be utilized for training and employment services for youth ages 14–21 would be eliminated. Many of these young people are at a critical juncture in their lives and at risk of dropping out of school. In my hometown, Cleveland, such a cut would reduce invaluable resources to this program by $1.3 million and reduce the number of people served by 700.

lic schools alone need $800 million just to bring them up to standard. The moneys provided in fiscal year 1995, while hardly enough to address the national need, is at least a beginning down payment to providing safe and updated facilities in which our children can learn.

It is even more important, Mr. Chairman, that the American public know these actions come when, at this very moment, the Appropriations Subcommittees are beginning to mark up the next round of additional cuts in nondefense, domestic programs. These subsequent cuts are expected to total $15–$20 billion and are to pay for disaster relief and to serve as a down payment on the Republican Contract With America. How can we in good conscience support these unnecessary defense additions knowing what's ahead for our domestic programs?

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to using domestic discretionary spending to offset defense funding that is not associated with the emergency supplemental. I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure and to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] a member of the Subcommittee on Defense.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 889, the Department of Defense emergency supplemental appropriations bill and H.R. 845, the companion recission bill. I certainly commend Chairman LIVINGSTON and Chairman YOUNG for reporting out an emergency supplemental that is fully paid for without burdening the Nation with any new taxes.

The have worked very diligently to bring this bill to the floor today, despite the fact that the administration submitted its request to us only 16 days ago on February 6.

At present, the full readiness of our Armed Forces is in jeopardy. Our troops have been engaged in an excessive number of unplanned and unbudgeted operations around the world, resulting in the deployment of 100,000 American troops within the past 4 months with nearly 50,000 troops remaining deployed today. This situation has forced our military leaders to pay

days from now, our men and women in uniform will suffer from a drastic cutback in supplies and training.

Let me share with my colleagues just a few of the consequences of inaction on this bill would have:

All U.S.-based Army units would have to stop most major training by May 31; four Navy carrier airwings would be forced to stand down and 500 aircraft would be grounded; and flight hours in the Air Force would be cut in half.

The next time a hot spot such as Bosnia or Korea or Kuwait flares up and the President orders our troops abroad on a mission, our troops will be less prepared for possible combat than they should be or will be using equipment that is below par.

Despite the urgency of this supplemental, the committee at the behest of the Speaker has fully offset all $3.2 billion of additional spending in the bill through specific recissions. This is a significant departure from previous committee practice, where the cost of emergency supplementals was enacted because it was in the national interest to do so.

Like many of my new colleagues in the freshman class, I was elected to cut government spending and maintain a strong national defense. This bill does both things.

We are now charged as Members of Congress with making hard choices that set priorities on spending scarce Federal dollars. We must decide which programs of lower priority must be cut in order to pay for the objectives of policy we enact into law. The recissions the committee has recommended are fair. The end result will be less government spending.

We have no greater priority in this body then to those American men and women in uniform who risk their lives each day to protect our borders and our vital interests abroad.

We also have, in light of the passage by this House of a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, an obligation to offset all increased spending, emergency or otherwise, and we are doing so in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is simple. We must pass this supplemental to keep our promise to the men and women of our Armed Forces, and in our current national financial condition, we must pay for it to keep our promise to the men and women of our Nation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

into the Pentagon's coffers, above and beyond what it needs, makes absolutely no sense. But offsetting those increases with cuts in funding for programs such as job training, school restoration, and the renovation of a vital component of our Nation's transportation infrastructure is bad policy, plain and simple. Is this the mandate that the voters sent last November? I don't believe so.

Quite simply, Mr. Chairman, the priorities reflected in this bill are fundamentally flawed. This is a classic guns versus butter debate. Instead of having the Pentagon trim some of its own fat this bill asks our children to shoulder the costs. Talk about shortsightedness: cutting $100 million needed for the repair, renovation, and construction of public elementary and secondary schools and slashing $200 million from the Department of Labor's training and employment services should make very clear who is serious about job creation, wage enhancement, and the American dream. Actions speak louder than words.

The legislation will also have a devastating impact upon one of the linchpins of our Nation's entire transportation infrastructure. I am speaking of the proposed rescission of $40 million for the redevelopment of Penn Station in New York City.

Mr. Chairman, it's pick on New York time again. Seventy five million passengers pass through Penn Station every year—that's 500,000 passengers a day. Penn Station is Amtrak's busiest station in the country. In fact, it serves more than 40 percent of all of Amtrak's passengers nationwide. It is also the hub for the New York City transit system, the Long Island Railroad, and New Jersey Transit. But ask any one of those passengers and they will tell you that the principal rail station of the largest city in the United States is falling apart. Penn Station is dangerous, and within 10 years the station is projected to exceed its maximum pedestrian occupancy level.

In order to address this situation, the Federal Government, the State of New York, and New York City have embarked on a cooperative plan to rebuild Penn Station.

This project enjoys bipartisan support, including that of Senators MOYNIHAN and D'AMATO, Gov. George Pataki, and Mayor Guiliani.

Mr. Chairman, the contract on America has claimed it's first victim from New York, it is outrageous that the Republican majority is stealing from Penn Station to increase the Pentagon's budget. There is no good reason why this project was singled out for the budget

easing the growing gridlock on our highways. The shops, restaurants, and other businesses that will develop in and around the station will also mean much-needed revenues for the local economy and the Federal Treasury.

The same people who criticize New York City for being too dirty and crowded are the ones most against efforts to improve Penn Station. But anyone who doubts the merits of the station's redevelopment project need only look a few blocks from where we stand today—to Union Station. Once an uninviting and unsafe gateway to our Nation's Capital, Union Station—rebuilt with millions of Federal dollars—now stands as a national model for urban renewal. I think most of my colleagues would agree that the money spent on Union Station was a wise investment. So, too, will be this investment in Penn Station.

☐ 1350

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 889.

As a freshman Member and a member of the Appropriations Committee, I commend Chairman LIVINGSTON and the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, BILL YOUNG, for a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues this bill is unusual. For the first time in recent years, we are paying in full for a supplemental emergency spending bill.

In the past 2 fiscal years alone, Congress spent over $13 billion in emergency spending with no offsetting cuts.

For this first time in a long time, this supplemental is not a Christmas tree full of special projects. The needs of the Defense Department are genuine, well documented and in line with our goal of combat readiness.

This supplemental bill simply replenishes accounts that have been depleted due to emergency spending for our operations abroad. Even with approval of this bill, personnel and readiness-related funding shortfalls will still exceed $2 billion for the remainder of fiscal year 1995.

We may disagree over the particular reductions, but that's the point. Each one of us could have written a different bill with different cuts. I can guarantee my colleagues that we will all have ample opportunities to offer those cuts as we move forward with the next round of rescissions and tough choices.

Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a difficult position here today. On the one hand, I readily acknowledge the necessity of this Defense Department supplemental because it is important to assure our military readiness. On the other hand, the rule which I just voted against—but which passed—couples this supplemental with domestic rescissions, and that is not acceptable.

Given the current budget climate, and shrinking discretionary caps, our domestic discretionary funds are all the more precious. Paying for increases in defense spending by taking money away from important domestic programs sets a dangerous precedent—one that I cannot support. Particularly when this is only the first in a series of dips we will make this year into the domestic discretionary accounts.

I oppose the domestic rescissions package proposed here today based on the policy choices it reflects. For example, the proposed $107 million rescission from the Advanced Technology Program—an initiative at the core of President Clinton's competitiveness agenda.

I welcome this opportunity to tell you about the merits of the ATP Program—the successes it can claim and its importance to our Nation's future manufacturing capability. But first I want to focus in on one point—U.S. competitiveness.

In today's global economy, our Nation is lagging behind in terms of dollars spent on research and development. In fact, in terms of civilian research and development, the U.S. ranks 28th out of 40 nations in the percentage of government funds allocated. And U.S. business investment in research and development is not making up the difference. It too is declining.

And while we sit here proposing to rescind funding from the ATP Program, across the oceans our competitors—Japan, England, Germany, Australia, and Portugal, just to name a few—are investing heavily in similar initiatives. For example, Japan is strategically targeting more than $600 million in resources to a government-private sector cost-shared program very much like ATP. They also sponsor several other programs aimed at developing basic technologies for industry. And why are they spending precious Government dollars on these programs? Because they realize that it will increase their competitiveness in ing—ATP recipients pay more than half the total cost of the research and development. This helps ensure that companies have a vested interest in the success of projects and in timely commercialization.

Some would assert that if the technology was worth developing, the private sector would do it themselves. This is simply not true. ATP projects focus on precompetitive, generic technologies. Those that industry cannot afford to develop on their own; those that will push them beyond state-of-the-art in technology development for the future.

Additionally, the report accompanying this package suggests that a rescission of $107 million in fiscal year 1995 will not do harm to the ATP Program, that it allows for funding all of our commitments. The real issue is that while a substantial amount of the ATP's appropriation for fiscal year 1995 has not been obligated as yet, essentially the entire appropriation has been committed. If this rescission package is approved, ATP will have to cancel about half of their existing competitions. Companies that have formed joint R&D ventures and that have typically invested tens of thousands of dollars in good-faith proposal writing efforts will be faced with a government which is unable to honor its commitments. Companies will conclude that the ATP Program cannot be relied on, and they will be reluctant to submit proposals in the future. This could have a devastating impact on the program.

I think as a nation it is time for us to face facts. We have underinvested in technology development. What we need now is to work to build our manufacturing capability and increase our competitiveness in the global marketplace. This goal will not be served by rescinding money from programs central to our competitiveness agenda. In fact, it would have the opposite effect. In a way, Mr. Chairman, rescinding money from ATP is very much like eating our economic seed corn. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this bill.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that has one serious defect among the others, and that is the reduction in funds for the Technology Reinvestment Project and the Advanced Technology Project.

Along with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], this is even worse than what we have done in the past. If we have watched, Japan took mercialization of defense technologies in the long-term, we will not have a defense which has the technologically capable systems within it.

The cost of maintaining these systems as we reduce the buy will be critical to include commercialization.

These are two important programs. The provision offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] protects them.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 889, the Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations Act. While I support the administration's request for emergency funds to replenish its accounts for U.S. troop deployments overseas, I am dismayed that the Republicans would choose to use this emergency appropriation bill as a vehicle to kill critical dual-use technology programs like the Technology Reinvestment Project [TRP] and the Advanced Technology Program [ATP].

The rescission bill before us wipes out $502 million from TRP and $100 million from ATP. While opponents have labeled the TRP as industrial policy, and have pointed to the limited failed projects, TRP continues to be a key component to our post-cold war defense strategy. The program assists our defense companies diversify into commercial markets, and develop practical commercial technologies and products while simultaneously maintaining and improving our military superiority. Our defense industries have always been the leaders in developing cutting edge technologies, and with Government-industry partnership programs like TRP, they will continue to be. Further, having industry develop these technologies in the commercial marketplace, with the assistance of TRP, allows the Federal Government to reduce its investment in research and development of modern weapons programs and thus save taxpayers money.

Southeastern Connecticut, a region heavily dependent on Department of Defense contracts, has some of the world's most highly skilled scientists, engineers, and craftsmen in the world. However, with the end of the cold war, many defense businesses have either closed their doors completely or are barely maintaining a work force half of what they were in the late 1980's. I have always maintained that we can utilize these skills not only for defense purposes, but for commercial applications as well. And since the advent of the TRP in 1992, I have been able to witness firsthand, the successes of defense diversification.

The School of Engineering at the University of Connecticut [UConn], located in my district, received $4 million to create an Engineering Academy for Southern New England. UConn, in partnership with other New England colleges, will educate engineers to lead industry in improving the region's manufacturing competitiveness.

The Photomics Research Center, another TRP participant, is helping small photonics firms in New England convert from defense-

the Naval Undersea Warfare Center for our Navy's submarines to clean up oil spills and limit the kind of environmental damage that occurred when the Exxon Valdez ran aground off the Alaskan Coast.

Once dependent on Government contracts for weapons systems, defense contractors are now developing new technologies which are maintaining and creating jobs in the fields of manufacturing, transportation, energy, and environmental cleanup. The unique TRP, which is not needs-based but rather is a competitive program and requires a 50-50 cost sharing between Government and industry, will maintain our Nation's technological and military edge. And by preserving this unique Government-industry partnership program, valuable technologies developed in the commercial marketplace will be available at lower costs to the Department of Defense.

This program has always enjoyed the support of both Democrats and Republicans. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to support this program by voting ''no'' on this bill and ''yes'' on the Obey substitute. The Obey substitute provides the requested amount of $2.5 billion and protects the TRP.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to our colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I request a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida and the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security, Representative BILL YOUNG. We would like to emphasize that dual-use technology is a valuable resource to the Department of Defense and is supported by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I will respond to the gentlewoman by saying that there is broad support to preserve the defense industrial and technology base by encouraging the development of technologies with both civilian and military applications.

Ms. HARMAN. As I said earlier in the debate, such dual-use technology is a key defense strategy for affordable, leading-edge technology. Programs such as the TRP's precision laser machining project employ dual-use technology to enhance technological superiority of defense systems while lowering cots. The PLM consortium represents what has been called a dual-use triple play—first, it brings together defense and commercial firms to put the speed and precision of military laser technology to work in machine shops

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would respond to the distinguished gentlewoman that we do believe in the concept of dual use technology and that it provides significant benefits. In fact, the fiscal year 1995 defense appropriations bill contains $1.5 billion for dual-use efforts this year, and we are not rescinding any of that money here.

Now, the difference between dual-use programs and TRP is this: Dual-use programs go directly to military items, military issues. TRP does not necessarily do that, and we are going to scrub the TRP requests in the fiscal year 1996 bill to make sure if they are funded they will be directly related to national defense and nothing else.

I thank the gentlewoman for her inquiry.

In the few seconds I have left, I want to point out to the Members that this is something very unusual. We have received a communication from the Citizens against Government Waste. Their first sentence says,

> The Council for Citizens against Government Waste strongly endorses H.R. 845 and H.R. 889, which together make supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense and pay for the increases with spending cuts. We oppose the Obey substitute and all other amendments. Together, H.R. 845 and H.R. 889 comprise good faith, pro-taxpayer legislation for which the Committee on Appropriations should receive credit and support, and we urge your vote for the committee's package.

That is, again, a pretty substantial statement.

In addition, if the Members would be willing to check with the American Legion or VFW or some of the other veterans organizations or military service organizations, I believe they would find also considerable support for the package that we present today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the defense supplemental appropriations bill and in strong support of the Obey substitute.

The original bill is objectionable in many scores. For example, it takes $1.4 billion from the domestic budget, Head Start, education, job training. It takes $1.4 billion from that and puts it to defense purposes.

In addition to that, it increases the deficit over the next 5 years, increases the deficit over the next 5 years.

Some of the cuts it makes in the domestic budget include school construction and youth employment job training. What it also cuts is the dual-use

strong objection to deleting this environmental restoration.

We are all for readiness for our forces. In order for them to be ready, they must be able to read. Let us not cut the domestic budget, and let us cut the deficit.

□ 1400

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Gingrich-ites who run this place have been calling at every opportunity for a balanced budget. Today they are celebrating the 50th day of their contract, and they are talking about a balanced budget.

But, you know, more than any media event they pull off around the country today, what happens on this bill and this Obey substitute will tell the American people whether there is any meaning to that contract, because at this first opportunity with a bill to do something about the budget deficit, how much do we cut under this proposal? Not one penny. In fact, we add to the budget deficit.

They say they are paying for this bill? I say let us stop paying for our defense by borrowing more money. Instead of a balanced budget, what this Congress is doing is digging in the same old deficit hole, and the Gingrich-ites tell us what we need are more shovels, not to stop digging in that same hole.

The Obey substitute provides what amounts to a line-item veto to assure a commitment to a pay-as-you-go finance, and it is essential it be adopted.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, chapter II of this bill would save some $100 million in funding for environmental restoration and waste management at DOE. The committee report says the reductions are not to affect direct cleanup activities. It expresses no position regarding funding for work to stabilize plutonium and reduce vulnerability to criticalities and other risks at other sites, at DOE sites which have serious public health and safety implications.

I would like to ask the chairman if these efforts as well are to be directed in the same way as direct cleanup efforts?

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

million reduction.

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the ranking member.

I would just like to say that this bill, in addition to all the other reasons not to vote for it, it takes a gratuitous slap at New York by gutting the revitalization of Penn Station.

Seventy five million riders pass through the station every year. It is heavily used, and it is a mess.

Yet this takes back that money and puts it into a lot of other things that are far less needed than what we have here.

I would urge every Member of New York, whether they been Democrat or Republican, to vote against this bill so we can save the money for Penn Station and finally get that station moving again.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms ESHOO].

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that the first spending package produced by the majority after passing the balanced budget amendment increases the deficit by $645 million over 5 years.

The Obey substitute cuts the deficit in fiscal year 1995 and is budget-neutral over 5 years.

It allows the Secretary of Defense to protect critical programs like the Technology Reinvention Program which leverages commercial technology in a way that benefits both the Defense Department and the commercial sector.

Mr. Chairman, in a front page story yesterday, the Washington Post reported that our Nation's military leaders are increasingly convinced modern warfare is experiencing revolutionary technological changes. National security experts believe those nations who do not maintain a technological edge will face serious threats to their security.

Now, at a time when America needs to make wise investments in defense technology, the Republicans' budget-busting shopping cart of defense priorities is full of last year's models and outdated strategy.

The Obey substitute reduces the deficit, cuts pork and allows budget priorities to be based on national security

marks.)

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, rather than voting for a measure that would seriously increase the deficit by nearly $645 million over 5 years while making fatal cuts to domestic programs such as the school improvement fund, youth job training programs, the INS emergency fund, and environmental cleanup and restoration efforts, I support the Obey substitute.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible alternative to the Republican emergency supplemental. It adds an additional $670 million in unrequested defense spending without identifying offsets for this spending.

This plus-up of the emergency supplemental is not for emergency funding. The Republicans are trying to tell the American people they are in favor of balancing the budget. The Obey substitute would allow the Department of Defense to guide the rescissions from lower-priority defense programs to offset this supplemental appropriations bill. It does not affect domestic cuts.

In my central California district, the cuts to the youth job training programs would impact many disadvantaged youth.

I ask my colleagues to support the Obey substitute.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California, [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member of the Committee on Science.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey substitute, in opposition to the bill.

My primary problem with the bill is that it resorts to the rescission of civilian programs, and it takes about half of the total rescissions from the area of technology, with which I am deeply concerned as ranking member of the Committee on Science.

The technology programs which are proposed to be cut have been described by several previous speakers, and I do not need add to that.

I would just like to make the point, however, that these programs have been developed over course of a number of years. They did not begin with the Clinton administration. They began, actually, with the Reagan and Bush administrations.

They need to be defended or else the future of this country and its techno-

fect, would make significant imporvements to the bill we are considering.

The amendment would provide the President's request of $2.54 billion in new budget authority to pay for peace-keeping missions, and no more. It would not make available an additional $670 million to increase defense readiness, which we simply do not need.

The amendment is deficit neutral. New spending would be offset totally with reductions in other defense accounts that the Secretary of Defense would allocate. Cuts in higher priority investment programs, like education and training and R&D, would not be made under this amendment to pay for defense increases.

Mr. Chairman, the direction taken in H.R. 889 is unwise and detrimental to the future of this country. The bill, if adopted in its present form, would lead us down a path that will eviscerate the R&D infrastructure of the United States.

The bill proposes increases in defense programs well above what the President has asked for, and would pay for those increases by making disproportionate cuts in R&D programs that have greater long-term payoffs.

The rescissions in this bill total $2.9 billion. About $1.3 billion or 45 percent of those cuts would be in competitively awarded, merit-based R&D programs. These cuts represent 2 percent of the entire Federal support for R&D in the current fiscal year.

Two programs that would be crippled under H.R. 889 are the Department of Defense Technology Reinvestment Program [TRP], and the Department of Commerce Advanced Technology Program [TRP]. Both of these programs leverage Federal funding with matching funds from the private sector to undertake high-risk, long-term R&D projects that have potential for large economic payoffs. These are the kinds of investments we should be making, and the Obey amendment would allow that.

Thirty years ago, Federal R&D support was over 2 percent of gross domestic product [GDP]. That level of support has eroded drastically since then. If the Congress adopts the President's fiscal year 1996 budget, Federal support for R&D would fall below 1 percent of GDP to its lowest level since 1958. This bill would make a bad situation even worse.

For years the Federal Government has given inadequate support for R&D, education and training, and other valuable public investments. This neglect has contributed significantly to the decay in our society and to the decline in our economic competitiveness and living standards. We can not let this situation continue.

We must make the investments today that are necessary to improve the future of the country and all our citizens. The Obey amendment is a step in that direction.

I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to put aside political differences and narrow interest and to do what is right for the

Defense rescissions	DOD	TRP & Defense conversion	537.0	19
	DOD	High definition systems	15.0	1
	DOD	Environmental restoration	150.0	5
	DOD	Procurement	758.2	27
Defense subtotal			1,460.2	51
Domestic rescissions	DOC/NIST	Adv Technology Prog (ATP)	107.0	4
	NASA	Wind tunnels	400.0	14
	DOE	Clean Coal Program	200.0	7
	DOE	Environmental restoration	100.0	4
	DOE	Youth Job Training Program	200.0	7
		Other domestic programs	395.1	14
Domestic subtotal			1,402.1	49
Total rescissions			2,862.3	
Net new budget authority			346.1	

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I simply say, in closing, that despite the comments that have been made by three previous speakers, this bill is not paid for, this bill is not paid for, this bill is not paid for, this bill is not paid for.

It is almost $700 million short of being paid for over 5 years, almost $300 million short of being paid for over 1 year.

If you have told your constituents that you are for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget and then you vote for this bill today without the Obey amendment, you are meeting yourself coming back.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I point out to the gentleman that the contentions that the bill is not paid for are ridiculous. We have not paid for supplementals in the past; we are paying for this one.

The fact is this bill costs $3.2 billion, and the defense rescissions in this bill are $1.8 billion in budget authority and nondefense rescissions are $1.4 billion, and there is a surplus of $14 million in the rescission over the cost of the bill.

This bill is needed, Mr. Chairman. We are talking about a 35-percent decline in the Defense Department in the last 11 years. The procurement amount has gone down by 17 percent over these last 11 years. We are cutting maintenance, we are cutting operations, and we are cutting training hours.

Secretary Perry on November 16, was quoted as saying that 3 divisions of the 12 Army divisions were way below adequate preparedness.

Even the President himself, on the 1st of December, said that he was at least $25 billion short on defense, and, as a matter of fact, GAO says we are $150 billion short on defense adequacy.

We are finding that jet engines are not getting repaired, troops are not getting adequate training hours, and Naval Reserves have stopped drilling. Training in Abrams tanks has been cut back because their engines are not being adequately repaired.

Military recruits have less than high school diplomas.

We are seeing accidents like F–15's shooting down U.N. helicopters and F–14's colliding. A F–14 crashed on the west coast. There was an accident on the Nimitz that killed a young seaman. Just in the last 3 days a Huey helicopter went into the sea overrunning Somalia, and a crewman was killed.

Mr. Chairman, the minority for some reason comes up with the idea, the frivolous idea, about not paying for this bill. They say we have not paid for it. We have paid for it. It is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of a much-maligned program that is being proposed for rescission under the Defense Department supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995, the Technology Reinvestment Program [TRP]. No one in this Chamber questions the need for the urgent supplemental appropriations bill for the Department of Defense. The funds are necessary to cover the costs of U.S. peacekeeping and humanitarian missions abroad. What many of us question, including myself, is the way we go about paying for these emergency costs by terminating funds for important programs like the Technology Reinvestment Program.

TRP is a unique program. It is designed to ensure that the United States has the most advanced military technology available and the most competitive commercial products found in the world marketplace. Advances in technology are occurring at a faster rate in the commercial world than in the defense industrial sector. The purpose of TRP is to give the military advance access to commercial technologies and thereby enhance our military capabilities at less expensive costs. TRP promotes the development of spin-on and spin-off technology. Under the program the Federal Government acts as an agent—a partner, if you will—in fostering public-private partnerships to develop advanced technologies with military and commercial applications.

One theme I constantly hear from both Democrats and Republicans is that Congress should develop a framework which encourages greater cooperation among government, business, and academia. TRP does just that. And with only a 2-year lifespan, this Chamber is now deciding that programs like TRP are a waste of taxpayer's moneys. This decision was made by the House Appropriations Committee without the benefit of serious public hearings. Isn't it ironic, Mr. Speaker, that while we agree in theory on the need for greater public-private partnerships, the bill we are considering rescinds $500 million for a program that will assist our military to leverage the commercial base.

Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues' attention to recent communications I have received from Arizona attesting to the importance of the Technology Reinvestment Program. For this and other reasons, I intend to vote against H.R. 889.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Tempe, AZ, February 16, 1995.

Hon. ED PASTOR,
Representative, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PASTOR: Last week the Washington Post ran an article that was critical of a Technology Reinvestment Project (TRP) funded program at Arizona State University. The ASU project had been singled out for having a rather nondescript title and thus may become a possible target for elimination as part of H.R. 889.

I am enclosing for you a review of that project, which we are happy to re-title, ''Manufacturing Across the Curriculum''.

Manufacturing Across the Curriculum has been a very effective program to re-engineer the educational relationship among the ASU Colleges of Engineering and Business with Arizona's largest high technology employers. Together, with the assistance of federal funding, we have created a new way to educate engineers and business students that gives them the kinds of skills necessary to immediately enter manufacturing positions and contribute to the success of these companies. We have found a way to eliminate the ''ramping up'' time necessary for new hires to these companies.

One of the most innovative and exciting parts of the ASU TRP is the placement of our students at companies such as Intel, where they actually take over full manufacturing lines. Realize the extent of corporate commitment this represents in the event that the students' errors may actually shut

appropriate to keep this project from being eliminated simply because it was poorly titled. We would encourage those who have criticized this project to read the attached summary explaining its purpose and accomplishments prior to committing themselves to its demise.

Thank you for your continued interest in and support of meaningful research activities at Arizona State University.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. BARNHILL,
Vice President.

CARBORUNDUM MICROELECTRONICS,
Phoenix, AZ, February 10, 1995.

Representative ED PASTOR,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASTOR: The new Congress has been quoted in recent news articles to have expressed concerns regarding the value and future of the Department of Defense sponsored Technology Reinvestment Program (TRP). We believe that the TRP is valuable to both the United States and to our Phoenix, Arizona based business. We are convinced that without it, from both a defense technology and industrial manufacturing standpoint, our country would be relinquishing a vital competitive position.

Carborundum's Microelectronics Design and Manufacturing Center in Phoenix was recently selected by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of DOD to lead a TRP program to develop more affordable electronic packaging based upon a new high performance ceramic material (aluminum nitride). If successful, this program will provide a dramatic and much needed improvement in the performance and reliability of ceramic electronic packaging for the DOD.

The continued advancement of ceramic electronic packaging is essential in the design of the future's competitive electronic systems, whether commercial or defense related. The TRP investment in this effort is in direct support of a critical U.S. industrial technology that was nearly lost to offshore manufacturers, and more specifically to the Japanese. In fact, over 80% of the current ceramic packaging needs of DOD are supplied by Japan. The playing field in this arena has not been level. The Japanese have been, both through financial and other means, subsidized by their government, while at the same time, American industry has maintained a robust competitive position, defending a basic national capability, with its own funding sources.

At our Phoenix, Arizona facility, we are determined to use the TRP 50/50 funding program to expedite the development of a new superior ceramic packaging material, aluminum nitride. We believe in the spirit of the new TRP format that relies on the joint investment of both government and industry. We are convinced that the result of this effort will be a lower cost, economical material that will meet the technical and cost objectives of the DOD. In addition, spin off benefits will include the development of a wealth generator for our country, increased market share for American industry, and an expansion in our Arizona employment base.

This technology is important now and for the 21st Century. The TRP provides the necessary defense, saves taxpayers money, and creates jobs, most of my colleagues would be jumping up to support it.

Well, there is such a program, and it's called the Technology Reinvestment Project, or TRP. But rather than support such a program, this bill would kill it.

That's a sad case of misplaced priorities, and I hope funding for TRP will be fully restored before this defense supplemental appropriations bill is sent to the President.

TRP was created in 1993 to deal with two conflicting realities of the post-cold-war world. The first reality is that our national security depends ever more on superior technology. The second reality is that in an age of huge budget deficits, we often can't afford to develop such technology solely for defense.

The answer to that dilemma is the concept of dual-use technology—cutting-edge technology that has both defense and commercial applications.

The TRP program is the centerpiece of our dual-use strategy. TRP awards matching funds to industry-led projects that have the potential both to strengthen our national defense and to develop competitive commercial products.

I want to underscore two critical aspects of this program. One is that projects are competitively selected purely on the basis of merit. Two, the program requires private industry to put up matching grants. For an investment of less than $500 million a year, TRP has leveraged billions of private dollars for research and development.

To me, that sounds like a great deal for the taxpayer.

I know that TRP works because I've seen the results in my own district.

TRP funding has made possible a partnership in Wallingford, CT, between Dow Chemical Co. and United Technologies Corp. to develop lighter, quieter, more fuel-efficient materials for aircraft construction. These new materials will be used on both the F–22 advanced tactical fighter and commercial aircraft. Because of these commercial opportunities, production costs for the Defense Department may be reduced by as much as 50 percent.

There are winners all around.

The Defense Department wins because its getting a better jet fighter.

Taxpayers win because they're paying less for critical defense technology.

The two companies involved win because they're developing whole new commercial markets.

And the people of my district win because good-paying jobs are being created.

At the direction of then-chairman, Ron Dellums, the National Security Committee staff last year surveyed TRP grant winners from the first year of the program. Responses were received from less than a fourth of the winners. But even that small number estimated a potential annual commercial market of $4.7 billion for their new technologies, creating or sustaining 18,000 jobs. Keep in mind that's on various overseas military expeditions and pay for it by cutting both defense and domestic programs.

It is the first time in my memory where Congress has cut domestic programs—like clean coal technology, worker retraining, and new school construction—to pay for our invasion of Haiti, missions to Bosnia, our withdrawal from Somalia, and Cuban refugee programs. This legislation takes money from potential job-creating initiatives like clean coal technology and worker retraining and instead funnels into wasteful programs such as paying back our allies for equipment they used to help with our invasion of Haiti.

There is no reason why other defense programs, or our foreign aid program, cannot be cut to accommodate this supplemental appropriation. It makes no sense to me to cut or eliminate programs which actually help people find jobs in order to help the Pentagon balance its budget.

Two programs in particular will, if eliminated, be very detrimental to my congressional district.

The Clean Coal Technology Program faces a $200 million cut from 1996 and 1997, a program which is essential to exploring future markets for high-sulfur Illinois coal; and the $100 million new school construction fund, which will be eliminated under this bill. This program is one from which the Carterville School District is interested in vying for funding for construction of its new school.

Mr. Chairman, to shift domestic funds to pay for overseas military operations is a troublesome precedent. I urge my colleagues to vote against this misguided bill and vote for the Obey substitute, which will pay for this supplemental by using defense funds and not cut into domestic programs.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Defense and in opposition to the rescissions contained in H.R. 889, the Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations and Non-Defense Appropriations Rescissions Act of 1995. I feel that this piece of legislation cuts many defense programs important to our national security and that the President's request is justified emergency spending which should not be offset.

I support our military's forays into diverse countries like Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia, and Haiti. I also want to improve the combat readiness of our Armed Forces which this bill begins to do. However, this bill goes too far in gutting vital programs such as the Technology Reinvestment Program [TRP], environmental restoration programs, and a program to help Russian and Eastern Europe pay for dismantling weapons, among others.

A program such as the TRP is very important to our national security interests. I, and others, feel that the TRP is vitally necessary to our country's future as we position ourselves strategically in the post-cold-war era.

targeting are in the following thrust areas: computers and software, electronics, sensors, simulation and manufacturing. Pushing these areas will ensure that commercial firms in this country can supply the superior technologies that will maintain our military advantage.

This bill also cuts $150 million in environmental restoration projects going on throughout the country. As you know, Mr. Chairman, DOD environmental programs support the readiness of U.S. forces by protecting military personnel and their families from environmental, safety, and health hazards. The programs ensure the usefulness and long-term viability of DOD lands and facilities. Major environmental priorities include actions to achieve compliance with existing laws and regulations, pollution prevention, and cleanup of past contamination. We simply cannot cut these funds.

In 1990, Congress and President Bush agreed that we needed to maintain the flexibility to fund unforeseen emergencies. Congress and President Bush recognized then that we do not have a reliable method to budget for these unforeseen costs.

No one could have, nor did anyone, predict the number of conflicts to which our military would be asked to respond. What we can not afford to do is to continue to depend on an unreliable method to forecast the scope of these supplementals. We should not begin the practice of haphazardly cutting programs in the middle of their fiscal year to pay for defense missions or natural disasters. Until Congress devises a method to budget for these unforeseen costs, we should keep the supplementals to the minimum amount and classify them as what they are—emergencies.

Mr. OBEY, the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, has offered an equitable alternative. The Obey substitute offsets defense spending with defense cuts without requiring cuts in nondefense programs. The Obey substitute grants the Secretary of Defense the authority to reduce or eliminate funding of low-priority defense programs without jeopardizing military readiness. Unlike the majority's bill, the Obey substitute is deficit neutral.

Mr. Chairman, given that as we speak committee staff is working on additional $15 billion in cuts in nondefense programs to pay for disaster relief supplemental and the so-called Contract With America, I believe it is unconscionable to ask nondefense programs to pay for peacekeeping and military relief missions.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support a supplemental appropriation for Defense. I oppose the rescissions contained in H.R. 889. Therefore, I cannot support the Department of Defense Supplemental Appropriations and Non-Defense Appropriations Rescissions Act in its current form.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend my friend, BILL YOUNG, who as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security moved quickly and skillfully to bring together this vital emergency supplemental—despite the inaction and the lack of communication from the White House. This subcommittee has always worked in a bipartisan manner in the interest of maintaining our national defense, and I know we will continue to do what we can to preserve our military capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. During the past 16 months, American men and women have been scattered across the globe to take part in 13 different contingency operations—in places like Haiti, Bosnia, Somalia, Rwanda, Iraq, and Korea. These operations—which have involved the deployment of more than 100,000 U.S. troops—are not planned expenses in the annual military budgets. We do not plan for operations like these—but we do have to pay for them.

The annual defense budget is a peacetime budget—it is to train and equip our troops, to support them, and to keep them ready for when we need to call upon them. And let me remind you all that the 1995 defense budget was the 10th consecutive year of reduced defense spending, in constant dollars. Ten straight years of defense cuts—a 35-percent reduction between 1985 and 1995.

This emergency supplemental is an emergency. If we don't pay now, our troops will pay later. Both the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that if this supplemental is delayed, then regular training, flight hours, and needed equipment repair and maintenance will not get done this year. Our readiness will be degraded, and our troops will suffer.

As has been noted, this emergency supplemental does contain offsets and rescissions which free up the readiness moneys we need for our troops without adding to the deficit. Half of the cuts in the supplemental come from low-priority DOD accounts, and half come from non-DOD rescissions.

I am pleased that we have been able to put together a budget-neutral Defense supplemental. The 104th Congress is listening to the American people and we are attacking the deficit. But I want to caution that we may not always be able to find offsets to pay for military contingency operations. If we commit our troops to these operations, I firmly believe we must be prepared to pay for them—and not decimate the readiness accounts in the regular defense budget.

I believe that when we commit our troops to these unplanned operations and put them in harm's way, we also make the commitment to keep up their training, their equipment, and their morale. That's what this bill does, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have great reservation about today's Defense rescissions bill. I am concerned that H.R. 889 cuts into important programs that puts Americans in the battlefield at-risk and this is the reason I am opposing it. The Appropriations committee has cut funding for many important programs including the System Improvement Committee's actions are inconsistent with its intent of preserving the readiness of our troops. By indiscriminately cutting the SIP Program, Congress is turning a blind eye to our electronic warfare needs in the name of readiness. Why sacrifice force structure for readiness? Readiness and force structure must be addressed simultaneously. I hope that this issue will be fully addressed before these cuts are finalized.

This is the first time in 13 years I have voted against a Defense bill—I do so not only because it affects Cannon Air Base in my district but because it is a bad bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute to the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin's substitute would successfully offset the $2.5 billion in supplemental defense appropriations requested by the administration, without eliminating valuable programs which invest in our Nation's future. I am particularly concerned about maintaining congressional commitment for the Penn Station/Farley Building renovations in my district in New York City.

Penn Station is the single most heavily used intermodal transportation facility in the country, serving passengers not only in the Northeast corridor, but also to and from points south and west. In fact, 75 million passengers use Penn Station each year. This station is a significant component of our passenger rail infrastructure.

A number of regional private and public entities have acknowledged that the current underground facility is inadequate, decrepit, and overcrowded, pushing Amtrak, commuter-train and subway riders into the same space. These entities have committed funding for improvements to the station. So far, the Long Island Railroad has completed its $200 million portion of the project. New York City and State have signed an agreement to fund their $100 million share. New Jersey transit will renovate its portion as Amtrak moves to the Farley Building. Amtrak will fund its portion of the project with revenues from commerce that will be attracted to the renovated Farley Building. Additionally, the Federal Railroad Administration and the Department of Transportation have sited Penn Station renovations as a high priority project, and the administration has proposed a $50 million expenditure for the project in fiscal year 1996. During a time when we are seeking funding based on public-private partnerships, this rescission is particularly shortsighted.

Congress provided $10 million in fiscal year 1994 for this project, and should continue its contribution to the public/private partnership which will benefit many Americans throughout the country. The funding which is proposed to be rescinded today is modest compared with other transportation expenditures for projects serving far fewer Americans.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Penn Station project is underway, the State and local governments have committed to pay for the bulk of the project, and Federal support makes

ations for which no funds were budgeted. Because these operations were not foreseen or planned for, enormous sums consumed by these operations cannot be compensated through normal budgetary channels within the Department of Defense.

The administration has stated that this is an emergency situation. Without additional funding, military readiness will be seriously jeopardized and we will be unable to fully finance the long overdue military pay raise Congress promised last year. It should be stressed that this is an emergency of the administration's own making. Many of the administration's military adventures abroad are not only expensive, but highly questionable. But if we don't replace the funds robbed from personnel and readiness concerns, the administration won't suffer, and this Congress won't suffer. But the people who will suffer are the men and women of the U.S. military who are trying to carry out their orders without adequate support. For that reason I support these bills.

Under our budget rules we don't have to offset this spending, we could simply increase the deficit. The administration wanted us to do just that. But, we can't just follow the letter of the law, we have to follow the spirit in which it is intended and do what's best for our Nation.

Both the administration and Congress have a moral obligation to offset the spending contained in this bill. The administration abdicated their responsibility, we can't afford to do the same. We have to be willing to do what the administration wasn't willing to do—we have to pay for things as we go. We have to make the tough choices and bring spending under control.

This bill will ensure that our Armed Forces get the funding they need to carry out their missions, while at the same time we will fulfill our obligation to bring the deficit under control.

I urge my colleagues to support these bills and the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Pursuant to the rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 889, modified by adding the text of the bill, H.R. 845, is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered as having been read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

H.R. 889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense to preserve

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army,'' $69,300,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy,'' $49,500,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps,'' $10,400,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force,'' $71,700,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy,'' $4,600,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army,'' $958,600,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy,'' $347,600,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps,'' $38,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force,'' $888,700,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

and Maintenance, Navy Reserve,'' $6,400,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PROCUREMENT

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army,'' $28,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force,'' $8,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program,'' $14,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

TITLE II

RESCINDING CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $15,000,000 are rescinded.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $18,800,000 are rescinded.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $150,000,000 are rescinded.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $80,000,000 are rescinded.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–139, $15,000,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $71,400,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $30,000,000 are rescinded.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–139, $100,000,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–139, $28,300,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $19,700,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–139, $1,200,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $58,900,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–139, $93,800,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $75,800,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–139, $77,000,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–335, $491,600,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCIES

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102–172, Public Law 103–50, Public Law 103–139, and Public Law 103–335, $161,287,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the balance of funds in the National Security Education Trust Fund (established pursuant to section 804 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1904)), other than such amount as is necessary for obligations made before the date of the enactment of this Act, is hereby reduced to zero: *Provided further*, That no outlay may be made from the Fund after the date of the enactment of this Act other than to liquidate an obligation made before such date and upon liquidation of all such obligations made before such date, the Fund shall be closed: *Provided further*, That no obligation may be made from the Fund after the date of the enactment of this Act.

emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy,'' $68,200,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps,'' $3,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force,'' $70,400,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army,'' $6,500,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy,'' $5,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps,'' $1,300,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Air Force,'' $2,800,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army,'' $11,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force,'' $5,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by

suant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy,'' $107,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps,'' $46,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force,'' $80,400,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve,'' $13,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve,'' $18,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve,'' $1,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve,'' $2,600,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard,'' $10,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 402. Notwithstanding sections 607 and 630 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2357, 2390) and sections 2608 and 2350j of title 10, United States Code, all funds received by the United States as reimbursement for expenses for which funds are provided in this Act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for the Department of Defense to Preserve and Enhance Military Readiness Act of 1995''.

TITLE V

That the following rescissions of budget authority are made, namely:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

IMMIGRATION EMERGENCY FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317, $70,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 103–317 for the Advanced Technology Program, $107,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER II

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in Public Law 103–316 and prior years' Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts, $100,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER III

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED AGENCIES

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–306, $62,014,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER IV

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading for obligation in fiscal year 1996, $50,000,000 are rescinded and of the funds made available under this heading for obligation in fiscal year 1997, $150,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided,* That funds made available in previous appropriations Acts shall be available for any ongoing project regardless of the separate request for proposal under which the project was selected.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333 for carrying out title II, part C of the Job Training Partnership Act, $200,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–333 for new education infrastructure improvement grants, $100,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

LOCAL RAIL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $13,126,000 are rescinded.

PENNSYLVANIA STATION REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–331, $40,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICAL FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 103–327, for construction of wind tunnels, $400,000,000 are rescinded.

The CHAIRMAN. No other amendment shall be made in order except an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 104–44.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. OBEY:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense to preserve and enhance military readiness for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Army,'' $69,300,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Navy,'' $49,500,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Marine Corps,'' $10,400,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Military Personnel, Air Force,'' $71,700,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Navy,'' $4,600,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy,'' $347,600,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps,'' $38,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force,'' $888,700,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide,'' $43,200,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve,'' $6,400,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PROCUREMENT

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Army,'' $28,600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Other Procurement, Air Force,'' $8,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for ''Defense Health Program,'' $14,000,000: *Provided,* That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary of Defense, to the maximum extent feasible (1) shall cancel or reduce only programs, projects, and activities that the Secretary determines are of the lowest priority; and (2) shall not cancel or reduce any program, project, or activity that the Secretary determines directly affects force readiness or the quality of life for service members and their families. No rescission, cancellation, or reduction under this paragraph shall take effect until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense submits to the Congress a notification of the proposed cancellations and reductions.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 302. Notwithstanding sections 607 and 630 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2357, 2390) and sections 2608 and 2350j of title 10, United States Code, all funds received by the United States as reimbursement for expenses for which funds are provided in this Act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

This Act may be cited as the ''Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for the Department of Defense to Preserve and Enhance Military Readiness Act of 1995''.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized in opposition for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I need, I think, to once again explain something. This is very elemental, but very important.

It is true that the Committee on the Appropriations operates by approving new budget authority, but in fact, ever since the Budget Act was passed, we must abide by the CBO scoring on outlays because the deficit is determined by what our outlays are, not what our budget authority is. And the fact is that, while we have a great effort on the Republican side of the aisle to suggest that this package is paid for today, in fact it is not. The Congressional Budget Office, which is the neutral scorekeeping operation, indicates very clearly that this bill will result in almost $300 million more in outlays than we would have if we did not pass it, and over 5 years it would result in spending almost $700 million more in outlays, which is the only way to count under the budget rules, to the deficit over 5 years.

Now what is happening here is very simple. Both sides agree that we ought to reimburse the Pentagon for expenses

numbers.

I say to my colleagues, ''You cannot do that if you want to look your constituents squarely in the eyes. The fact is that without the Obey amendment you will go home tonight having voted to expand the deficit, and that will be the first vote that you have cast on an appropriation bill since you proudly told your constituents that you were for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.''

I say that to cast an inconsistent vote like that is—well, I will not say it. It would be against the House rules, but it would not be kind. Let me simply explain the amendment.

What the amendment says is that we should simply go back to the original administration request, provide the $2.5 billion to replenish the funds that the Pentagon wanted replenished, and then, to make certain that it is paid for, we simply give the Secretary of Defense the authority to select low priority, nonreadiness, non-equality-of-life programs for rescissions in order to fully pay for it. That is all this amendment does.

Now I would suggest to my colleagues, ''Why?'' Why should we shield projects such as the Wyoming project to assist the Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that young ferrets have the best opportunity to survive when released into wild prairie dog colonies? Why are we going through this elaborate charade to protect those kinds of projects? What we are asking is to pay for what the Pentagon is asking for, give the Secretary of Defense the ability to knock out baloney like that rather than going after other items which are of much higher priority to the Defense Department and much higher priority to some people who are concerned about domestic programs.

Why should we also refuse to scrub the defense budget for the last one-half of 1 percent that would be necessary to honestly balance the budget on this bill? I ask, ''Why shouldn't we do that? Why should we continue to protect, for instance, the two executive jets added to the defense bill last year despite the fact that the Pentagon never requested them? Why should we be looking at adding $21 million to extend and upgrade the runway and fueling system at Tinker Air Force Base even though Tinker Air Force Base may be scheduled for base closing under the next base closing round?''

So, to me it is very simple, it is very simple. I say to my colleagues, ''If you want to go home to your constituents tonight and say that you have actually

is give the Secretary the authority to eliminate low grade projects and low grade pork such as the items I've mentioned rather than going after much more important programs in the budget.''

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the gentleman's amendment would, in fact, eliminate $1.46 billion in specific, specific Department of Defense, rescissions that the committee has identified as being low priority, and that is twice the amount of actual rescissions that anybody, the President, the Defense Department, has ever talked about. In the President's letter he says he would ask the Secretary of Defense to identify approximately $700 million in nonspecific reductions. He has not identified them. He just says he will allow the Secretary of Defense to just pick them out of a hat. We do not know what they are going to be. Second, the Obey substitute grants line-item veto authority to the Department of Defense to do exactly the same thing, to find, cancel, and reduce up to $2.25 billion in previously appropriated funds. No congressional review is provided. The cancellation is automatic after 30 days of notification. It gives the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense, the authority to just pick them out of the hat without any congressional review. Third, it eliminates the enhanced readiness funding that the Department of Defense and all of their leaders say they desperately need by $670 million. Fourth, it would eliminate some $1.4 billion in nondefense offsets that we have used to pay for the programs that everybody on the other side says we are not paying for. We have specified nondefense items proposed for reduction in the companion bill that has been incorporated in this bill that are low priority.

We have an opportunity to reduce spending, and we should do it mainly in the foreign aid programs and low-priority domestic programs. The real flaw, Mr. Chairman, in the Obey amendment is that even if we give the Secretary line-item veto authority to cut $2.5 billion, he cannot do it. He is not going to do it. He could not even find $700 million like the President wanted him to find initially as stated in a letter to our committee last month. To this very day the Secretary of Defense has yet to identify 1 red cent of cuts, not 1 red cent.

even guarantee budget authority cuts.

□ 1420

In fact, the argument has been made that by adopting the Obey substitute and giving the Secretary of Defense line-item veto authority, he can make the bill outlay-neutral. Well, who knows? Who knows what the Secretary might do? Who knows what programs he might cut? Depending on the mix of cuts he picks, we might not get as many outlay cuts as are in the bill that is actually before us today. What if the Secretary goes after long-lead procurement? What if he goes after critical readiness accounts?

Giving the Secretary line-item veto is just buying a pig in a poke—we take specific cuts now and capture the savings now. Actually the substitute makes no sense at all.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to defeat the Obey substitute and vote ''aye'' on the final bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that the Obey amendment does not guarantee that this money will be saved? I want to quote from page 5, lines 22, 23, and 24:

> Of the total funds made available for the Department of Defense in Public Law 103–335, $2,250,000,000 are rescinded.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot get more plain than that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, in December I took a trip down to Fort Hood, where I met with 3 of the division commanders. In the continental United States there are eight divisions, and I met with three of them. We talked about the readiness at Fort Hood and the problem they have had with lack of money in order to maintain readiness.

I do not mean to say that if they were to be deployed, by the time transportation would be available they would not be ready to move. But they were in a state of sea readiness, which is substantially below the rate we would like to see if they were to go into combat tomorrow. We could probably get them up to a top level in 30 to 45 days.

But the key to our success in deploying troops to Saudi Arabia in order to stop the Iraqis was the fact that we had troops ready to move and we were able

From Fort Hood I went down to Fort McPherson, where I met two more of the division commanders. So I met with five of the eight division commanders. Each one of them said to me that their readiness was on shaky grounds, that they had a state of readiness where they were concerned about the amount of money available.

I disagree with what the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to do. In the past we have always felt that emergency supplementals should not be offset. He takes a different position, and I understand that. His position is that because of the balanced budget amendment, it ought to be offset. I take the position, the same position I have always taken, that this is an emergency supplemental, we are paying for deployments that the President ordered, they are humanitarian type deployments in most cases—the Kuwaiti deployment was paid for by the Kuwaitis—and they should not be offset.

As a matter of fact, when I was down at Fort McPherson, we went on down to Fort Bragg, and I talked to a couple of NCO's who are doing the training. The one NCO who had been in the Army for about 5 years took two salad dressing containers, and he said, ''This is the way I train my troops. I move this salad container''—I said, ''Wait a minute. You are not using this one?'' He said, ''No, we don't have what's necessary in order to do an adequate job of training because the money has been cut back so much.''

This is an example from enlisted people of what is involved in the actual training.

We had a terrible tragedy the other day at one of the bases. Some of the Rangers were involved. That is very difficult training. It is some of the most difficult training in any of the Armed Forces. They push them to the hilt. I do not know that happened there. I hope this did not happen because of inadequate supervision. I hope it did not happen because they did not have the money to get the helicopters out there. I have no idea what the results were, but I am concerned when those kinds of accidents start to happen.

At one time in the 1970's we only flew about 12 hours a month. We had accidents with some of the airplanes of the Air Force, and we had a very high accident rate. When we start losing the training time, we start increasing the accidents, and it is counterproductive and it costs us a lot more money.

We have been very careful in the way we have reduced the structure of the Armed Forces. As I said before, we

Obviously, our main line of defense is nuclear deterrence. We also have to worry about the possibility of somebody floating a nuclear device into one of our harbors, and we have to spend money on those kinds of things.

I am convinced that the offset that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], offers goes too far. I am not in favor of rescissions, but I would rather see Mr. OBEY's offset defeated, have us pass the bill as it is, and will work it out in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a defeat of the Obey substitute and passage of the bill so we can get it to conference.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY].

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with NASA, in a colloquy, if he is willing.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would be happy to do so.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is aware, my district contains the Engineering Development Center at Arnold Air Force Base near Tullahoma, and we believe that is an ideal place to locate new aeronautical facilities for NASA.

I was wondering if the gentleman could clarify the effect that this rescission bill will have on our ability to develop new wind tunnels.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the rescission bill does specifically put on the block the authority for some $400 million for proposed wind tunnels. Frankly, it is time for us to rethink that whole technology and the Federal Government's appropriate role in it. It does not necessarily eliminate the possibility of the Federal Government's being involved over time.

Mr. HILLEARY. I think one of the stipulations with this original $400 million we are rescinding in this bill was that the President would include in his fiscal year package for 1996 an additional $400 million.

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is correct.

Mr. HILLEARY. And he did not do that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes. When the $400 million was appropriated last year, the NASA appropriation bill contained a statutory requirement that the administration at least match the funds in the fiscal year 1996 budget. However, they did not do so.

bill today. Over time I fully expect that our subcommittee will address the question in a different way and perhaps redesign whatever the role of the Federal Government is that may be involved. I do expect that technology to go forward.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the exchange that we just heard demonstrates why the committee bill does not in fact balance the budget. On the wind-tunnel item, that money was appropriated subject to authorization. It has never been authorized.

Therefore, CBO itself has indicated correctly that since it has not been authorized, it cannot be spent. Even though it cannot be spent, the committee amendment cuts the money and pretends it saves money. CBO says we have not saved any money by cutting the wind-tunnel item because there was no money there to be spent in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, that is why the Republican proposal does not balance the budget, because it cuts funny money, and it does it twice.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

□ 1430

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Obey amendment for several different reasons. I would prefer, first of all, that we did not offset this money. I think that we are talking about an emergency appropriation here, and I think we are setting a precedent here that is very, very dangerous. Here is why.

We are going to look into the future and future administrations are going to have to look at national security decisions, that is, as to whether or not we are going to do some early intervention, that is to say take care of the cold before we get pneumonia in national security. We are going to have to look at that as a budgetary problem, as opposed to a national security problem.

I think we are going to have administrations in the future not taking the kinds of early action that we must in order to protect the national security of this country.

Now, that is the first side. However, if we are going to offset this, and if we are going to start out by taking $1.8 billion out of the Defense Department

money to assist the Russian Government and some of the satellite countries to reduce the nuclear threat, then that threat reemerges to us and we have to increase our DOD budget to meet that new threat. That is part of it.

The other part on that particular element, Nunn-Lugar, we are taking out of Russia and the satellite countries nuclear scientists and allowing them to stay in the country instead of selling their information to Iraq, Iran, Libya, and other rogue countries throughout the world that would in fact bring us a greater threat, thereby again increasing the DOD budget.

The TRP I think has been adequately discussed here. Clearly that is a program that makes us money, the transfer of technology between civilian and military in a joint use. We are getting 100 percent more on our dollar than we would otherwise.

Then there is the Russian housing that everybody wants to make fun of. Mr. Chairman, Russia is not a potted plant. They are a threat to this country from a national security standpoint, and we have got to do everything in our power to make sure that that threat does not rise beyond our ability to meet it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire how much time each side has?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 24½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to point out only the Penn Station and the wind tunnel projects were both appropriated but not authorized. We are rescinding the appropriations. That is a real rescission. They were appropriated in previous bills. So we are cutting those out until such time as this House deliberates in the authorization committees and determines that they are worthwhile projects and should go forward.

As far as the Nunn-Lugar money, we are not cutting any money out to denuke the Russians. We are cutting money out to resettle the Russian soldiers in $25,000 plush complexes when some of our own service people are living in substandard housing.

Finally, I just want to reiterate, this entire bill is supported by the Citizens Against Government Waste. Tom Shatz, the president of that group, said that this is good faith, pro-taxpayer legislation for which the Appropriations Committee should receive credit

my distinguished colleague and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding and the fine job he is doing, along with the entire Committee on Appropriations.

As a member of the Committee on National Security for now 9 years and this session chairman of the Research and Technology Subcommittee, I have to share with my colleagues the frustration that I felt this morning sitting in on our hearing, full committee hearing, where we had the heads of the services come in and practically beg us to support the supplemental on the floor today. They made some very dire predictions to us of what would occur if we did not in fact fund this supplemental, and told us in very real terms what would happen in terms of Army training, shutting down at the end of May of this year, the Navy not being able to go forward with maintenance and operations and upkeep of our basic naval ships and vessels, and what really bothered me is that here we are now facing the prospect of funding a supplemental, which I totally support and congratulate the chairman and the subcommittee chairmen for fully paying for, when the real debate here should be focused on the administration's policy of committing our troops in places without the prior consent of this body.

As I pointed out last week on the House floor during the debate on the National Security Revitalization Act, what frustrates me the most today is a situation like we see going on in Haiti where we are using DOD dollars to pay the salaries and the benefits of troops from Bangladesh, Nepal, Guatemala, and other Third-World nations.

Here we are using DOD money to fund the full costs and benefits for foreign troops, when a unit of 600 troops of the Second Armored Division in Texas had to train in a tank range as though they were in tanks, because we did not have enough money to support the fuel and maintenance costs of keeping that tank unit operational and prepared.

Here we have a situation where the defense budget has been cut over 5 years by 25 percent, yet during that same 5-year time period, nondefense spending in the defense bill has increased by 361 percent. So while we are dramatically downsizing the amount of defense spending, we are rapidly increasing those items in the defense budget that our good leadership has seen fit to take out and say hey, we have a readiness problem. We have a problem with modernization, and we cannot fund these other niceties that Members of Congress want to stick in

want to use my time for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify the language included in H.R. 889 as it relates to the rescission of $150 million in environmental cleanup activities. Is it the committee's intent for the Secretary of Defense to retain discretion over the remaining $1.6 billion included in the Defense environmental restoration account?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, that is the intention of the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I also understand that the legislation still enables the Department of Defense to proceed with their fiscal year 1995 environmental restoration program. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the chairman for clarifying this matter which will support the release of $1.3 million from DERA for the cleanup of excess military lands identified for transfer to Guam under Public Law 103–339.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 889 and in support of the Obey amendment. I oppose the legislation before us not because I do not believe in being fiscally responsible, but because the current bill would seriously hamper our commitment to environmental cleanup and jeopardize the process of transfer of military lands in which we are engaged throughout our Nation. The Obey amendment offers a sensible alternative.

The package before us today would rescind $150 million from the Defense environmental restoration account or DERA. While I understand the difficult task that the appropriators had in coming up with rescissions that will fund ongoing contingency operations, I believe that taking it from DERA is the wrong place to look.

DERA is part of the so-called nontraditional defense spending that is under attack these days. It may be easy to assume that by curtailing funding for environmental surveys and studies we will reduce DOD's responsibilities. The reality is quite the contrary.

By taking this action today, we will not reduce DOD's responsibility one iota. And environmental cleanup is not something that we can relegate to the private sector or assume that charities will take over. This is not so much a Government program, as a Government responsibility. The Secretary of Defense requested this $150 million in fiscal year 1995 for a reason. It is not frivolous or unimportant spending.

Without funding, DOD is left with what I term an unfunded liability. They are still responsible for cleanup and the condition of

years have relied on local bases for an economic stimulus will be left without the resources to affect their economic future.

There are programs in the fiscal year 1995 budget that the Secretary of Defense did not request. It is his job to decide what our Nation's defense priorities should be. Why don't we let him decide these matters instead of having 435 Secretaries of Defense in Congress step in.

I urge my colleagues to reject the approach taken in H.R. 889 and instead vote for the Obey amendment that would leave the rescissions up to the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, where the authority should rest.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in the next few weeks I want to promise all my friends who worry about not making real cuts that this committee will in fact be back on the floor with approximately $15 billion in real cuts. So if the other side is concerned we are not seeing sufficient numbers of cuts today, I hope they will stick with me, shoulder-to-shoulder, as these new cuts come to the floor. I look forward to their enthusiastic support, and I promise the House that they are coming.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and inform the Chair I only have one additional speaker, and we would ask that he close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 19½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 14½ minutes remaining. Under the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana has the right to close.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

☐ 1440

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

Mr. Chairman, one key advantage of the Obey amendment is that it will allow the Secretary of Defense to decide what to cut and what not to cut in order to pay for this supplemental. In particular, this is why I rise to speak in support of it, it will allow the Secretary to avoid some $250 million in rescissions from environmental restoration and waste cleanup accounts, $150 million off the DOD account and $100 million off the DOE account.

Now, I know there is a widespread notion in this body and outside this body that somehow or another these appropriations do not really belong in the defense spending bill anyway, that

quired by law. They are imposed on the Department by regulations, by court decrees that they have entered into in State after State. And we are not just skimming these accounts, $150 million off DOD, $1.78 billion seems like it is not that big a hit, $100 million does not sound like much when DOE gets about $3 billion for this particular type of activity. But they are already at the margin because DOD has already squeezed these accounts and so has DOE.

And do not take my word for it. Let me quote the eloquent words of Gov. Pete Wilson of California in a letter he wrote to the Secretary of Defense dated January 25, 1995.

> The recent decision by Congress to cut environmental restoration for 1995 continues a disturbing trend begun last year when Congress rescinded 507 million from the BRAC account. California was reassured that this rescission would not affect environmental work at closing military bases, but work was indeed scaled back at several California military bases due to the cut. If the Federal Government will not keep its cleanup obligations, how can we expect private industry to do the same?
>
> California expects DOD to comply with the federal/state cleanup agreements it has sighed at California military bases. DOD is contractually obligated to seek sufficient funding to permit environmental work to proceed according to the schedule contained in those agreements. California will not hesitate to assert its rights under those agreements to seek fines and penalties and judicial orders compelling DOD to conduct the required environmental work.

If we pass this supplemental, we will in effect say that DOD is not subject to the same laws as other businesses.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the bill and in support of the Obey substitute.

The bill rescinds more than $500 million from the Technology Reinvestment Program and would kill the TRP which leverages commercial technology in a way that benefits both the Defense Department and the private sector.

The TRP's mission is to maintain our defense industrial and technological base by promoting an integrated, national industrial capability which provides the most advanced, affordable military systems and the most competitive commercial products.

The defense industry on Long Island has been hard hit by downsizing and TRP has provided opportunities to develop dual use technologies that contribute to our national defense. Map potentially hazardous radioactive environments in order to prevent health and safety threats due to radiation contaminated materials. The system is also valuable for low-cost development of defense weapon systems and surveillance of nuclear sites for treaty verification applications. Comparable systems are not currently available.

Target Rock Corp., Peerless Instruments Co. of Elmhurst, NY, and MPR Associates of Alexandria, VA, have collaborated on a proposal to develop zero emissions control valves. These valves are hermetically sealed and prevent inadvertent leakage of hazardous material. The valves are designed to help U.S. manufacturing companies cost effectively meet the fugitive emissions requirements for volatile organic compounds defined in the Clean Air Act and the current EPA and OSHA regulations for personnel safety from these emissions. The valves are a direct technology spin-off from the valve technology that is critical to the U.S. Navy's nuclear fleet.

Mr. Chairman, the TRP has come under intense criticism that it does not have military applications. These are but two of many examples that show that dual-use technology can and does work. There are similar examples nationwide.

I believe that it is too early to judge the TRP. Even when research and development programs are focused entirely on military applications, it can take many years before such programs actually produce technology that can be incorporated into battlefield weapons.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee should have considered alternative cuts. The thousands of defense workers who helped us win the cold war deserve our support during the transition to a civilian economy. The TRP provides that support.

I urge my colleagues to support the Obey substitute and save the TRP.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the distinguished ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of the Obey amendment. This bill clearly increases the deficit over the next year and over 5 years. Clearly, the House has spoken and said that emergency supplementals should be a thing of the past.

Personally, I do not agree with that judgment. I think the Federal Government should be able to respond to emergencies, both international and domestically, at times of great need.

However, the House overwhelmingly said ''no'' when we passed the balanced budget amendment. We said that the Congress would need to live within certain limits regardless of what happened internally or externally and that we in making decisions over our appropriating process.

The Obey amendment lets the Department make its judgments on programs that they deem to be of lower importance and of lower priority to pay for the bill.

It is an amendment that is thoroughly consistent with what the House has done in recent weeks, and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I rise in support of his amendment.

I would like to say a brief word, if I may, about the rescission of $150 million in the environmental restoration account. There is a lot of talk these days about contracts. Let me suggest to Members that if they support this rescission we will be violating a very important contract. I site a place in Cape Cod because I know it best, but there are dozens replicated all over the country.

A military installation, Otis Military Reservation, has polluted the groundwater of four communities, poisoned the drinking water of thousands and thousands of people. There is an obligation, a contract, if you will, to clean that up. It is an obligation dictated by common sense. It is an obligation dictated by common sense. It is an obligation dictated by the requirements of the public health and dictated by the law.

If we refuse to give the Defense Department this money, that obligation stands, that mandate stands. It is, horror of horrors, at that point an unfunded mandate. And that work will stop. Whether it will stop at Cape Cod or the other installations around the country, I do not know, but it will stop.

The problem will not go away. The obligation will not go away. The mandate will not go away. But the funds to fulfill it will.

I urge Members to think very, very carefully about that before voting for this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

ministration presented a $2.6 billion supplemental request. The Committee on Appropriations chose to fund $2.5 billion of that $2.6. Then on top of that added $670 million for so-called readiness enhancement. So what we are looking at now is not a $2.6 billion but a rather $3.2 billion bill.

We raided $1.5 billion of a number of domestic programs. It is a Robin Hood in reverse, as it were. The military budget is huge, some $200 billion. Many of these domestic programs have been scraped to the bone. There is no need, it seems to me, to do that. The Pentagon was about the business of finding the necessary dollars to fund these 670 million dollars' worth of programs that are high priority. It seems to me what the Committee on Appropriations did was inappropriate at this time.

Finally, the authorization process is just going forward, Mr. Chairman. All of us, the dance that is going to be done is fiscal 1996, I call it the ''readiness dance. Everybody is going to try to ''out readiness'' each other.

The one account that probably will end up overfunded is the readiness account. We do not need to do it in the supplemental.

For those reasons, let us bring back some reason and sanity to this process. In that regard, I would rise in support of the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has two fundamental flaws, both of which my amendment attempts to correct. The first is that despite the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana has indicated that $15 billion in domestic cuts, rescissions, will be provided in the next 2 weeks, they still insist on digging into the domestic side of the budget for an additional $700 million. Why do they do it? So that they shield low priority pork in the defense budget from scrubbing by the Secretary of Defense. That is why it is done.

The second problem is that even after they do that, even after they pretend that their bill is paid for, they still wind up with $640 million being added to the deficit over 5 years and $284 million being added in this year alone.

□ 1450

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, if they are going to vote for the constitutional amendment to balance the budget, then they should not tell the American people that the first time they actually have an opportunity to produce on that promise by actually doing something real, on a real bill, which spends real dollars or cuts real

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reject this defense supplemental and to vote for the Obey substitute. I urge all of us to step back for a moment and take a step back from the technical details of the bill, and to realize that we are voting today on something much larger and much more important than the details of this bill.

This vote is about the trust of the American people. It is about a Congress that keeps its promises, and is not afraid to match rhetoric with reality.

Last month, Mr. Chairman, we passed a balanced budget amendment. Now we are being asked to approve our first spending bill since passing that amendment, our first opportunity to make good on that commitment.

However, the defense bill that has been offered by the majority does not honor that commitment, it corrupts it. It does not draw down the Federal deficit, it increases it by $645 million over the next 5 years. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it does not preserve the trust of the American people, it trades it away in a flash of red ink.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members this question: Can we afford to say one thing and then a few days later do the opposite? Is that really our idea of leadership? This is not serious public policy, Mr. Chairman, it is bold-faced hypocrisy. I may not have agreed with the final language of the balanced budget amendment, but I believed my colleagues when they said they would lay out a diet of fiscal responsibility. However, this spending bill is not a diet, it is a spending binge.

Thankfully, there is a choice. We can support the Obey substitute, which meets America's needs without busting the budget. This substitute provides every penny our Defense Department needs to maintain readiness, and it actually cuts the deficit by $128 million next year alone, without increasing the deficit at all over the next 5 years.

Best of all, if we choose this substitute, we choose serious policy over hypocrisy.

Mr. Chairman, whether we like it or not, this first opportunity after the balanced budget amendment sends a powerful message. I urge Members to make it a message of responsibility, a message of commitment, a message of reason, not one of recklessness.

There can be no good reason to bust this budget after the balanced budget amendment. Vote for the Obey substitute, vote for a bill that will balance

such an outstanding job on this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to something the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] mentioned about environmental cleanup. The decision we take here on the environmental issue here does not have a thing to do with moneys appropriated for environmental cleanup. To the contrary, we still leave about $1.65 billion available for cleanup.

There is a fund of $400 million for the study of potential future cleanups, potential future cleanups. Of that $400 million, we ask to rescind $150 million. It will not have an adverse effect on environmental cleanup.

Mr. Chairman, the issue seems to be whether or not the bipartisan bill presented by the subcommittee and the full committee is baloney, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has said, and I understand what baloney is; or that it is a charade, as the gentleman said, and I understand what a charade is; or that it is a red herring, as the gentleman suggested, and I do understand what a red herring is; or that we are posing for holy pictures.

Here is where I have a little problem, because I do not know what a holy picture is. I do not know what it means to pose for holy pictures. I have heard that statement an awful lot, Mr. Chairman, from the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I do not really understand what posing for holy pictures means.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for 20 seconds for a response as to what a holy picture is.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the gentleman is not Catholic.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is a strong debate here today about whether or not the bipartisan committee bill is paid for, but we believe that it is paid for, honestly, sincerely. We have reason to believe that it is paid for, because the numbers add up. We have been very specific.

Now, if we want to compare, we are dealing now with the Obey substitute, compare the Obey substitute with the bipartisan committee bill and we cannot do it. The reason we cannot do it is that the Obey substitute does not have any specifics in the area of rescissions, no specifics. How do we compare?

The Obey substitute may never pay out in outlays, because we do not know and he does not know today what the

makes the Secretary of Defense even more powerful, because he could veto whatever and it would not have to come back to Congress for a reconsideration, or a re-vote, where a line-item veto would have to.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the point that the amendment provides the Secretary cannot make those cuts until it gives Congress 30 days' notice, which is the normal notice during the reprogramming process, so if we object, we can work it out with him.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. However, Mr. Chairman, the procedure for overriding a veto in the line-item veto is nonexistent in the Obey substitute. The point is, we are specific. If we read the report, we can see exactly what we are providing money for and exactly what we are rescinding.

I want to repeat something I said earlier. A reporter asked me about ''You guys spending this money.'' We did not spend this money. This money was spent by the President of the United States when he sent about 100,000 American troops around the globe in the last year to Bosnia, Somalia, Rwanda, Cuba, Haiti, Southwest Asia, Korea, and the list goes on and on.

He did not come to Congress to get authority for those contingencies or for those deployments, but now we have a bill and we have to pay for it. The responsible position is to pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, I just suggest that Congress has that responsibility, and not the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary of Defense had authority to rescind programs, let me tell Members one of the things that is in this bill for 1995 that they wanted to get rid of, and it was made very public. That was the money we put in there for breast cancer research. That was suggested to us at the subcommittee, and we said no, we are not going to rescind the breast cancer research money.

Shortly thereafter, the President issued a directive to the Secretary, ''No, you cannot rescind it, either.''

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will let me finish what I have to say, and then if I have time, I will be glad to yield to him. He is a very strong proponent of the national defense, and we know that.

Mr. Chairman, the question of housing has come up, housing for the soldiers in the military are having to live in substandard housing.

We want to correct that, Mr. Chairman. We want to make the money available to pay for the 2.6-percent pay increase for members of the military. If Members will check with the commissaries and the bases where Members might reside, in their districts, find out how many young soldiers—sailors, airmen, marines, male or female—how many of them are coming with food stamps. Over 11,000 of our young troops are eligible for food stamps, because of their expenses and their low incomes.

□ 1500

We provide in our package, our enhancement package, for the additional 0.6 percent of the pay raise.

I made a commitment, as many of us have many times, that I would not vote to send an American soldier into combat or a hostile situation without knowing that I had done the very best to provide them with the best training and the best technology possible before sending them into a hostile situation. I am going to stick by that commitment and this bill that we consider today is a part of that commitment.

I want to speak for some of these people who are going to be affected by this bill and their training, or their morale, their readiness, their quality of life.

I want to speak in behalf of the Marine gunnery sergeant and all of his colleagues who are on the U.S.S. *Essex* off Somalia today.

Or the wife and kids of the Army Special Forces lieutenant who are left behind in Fort Bragg, NC, while he works the countryside in Haiti.

Or the Air Force reservist flying airlift missions in support of operations around Bosnia.

The Navy families left behind in San Diego as their loved ones are deployed on the aircraft carrier *Constellation* in the Persian Gulf.

The AWACS crews flying over Saudi Arabia checking on Saddam Hussein.

The Marine F–18 pilot flying out of Aviano, Italy enforcing the no-fly zone over Bosnia in Operation Deny Flight.

The Army personnel manning the Patriot missile battalion we sent to Korea because of the increased tensions there.

The fighting unit at Twenty-nine Palms where they are forced to live in barracks that were damaged by the Joshua Tree earthquake and never repaired.

The 10th Mountain Division from Fort Drum which has been deployed over the past 2½ years to Florida for worse shape than the runways at Pendleton.

What I am saying is this bill is addressing those types of issues, and it is important that we pass this bill with its specifics and not take a pig in the poke as offered by the Obey substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. My friend, the gentleman from Florida, will recall on two occasions last week, I spoke as strongly as I possibly can in favor of taking care of the troops. I think that your measure today is a giant step in that direction.

One of the items that you could have very well mentioned is the fact that several hundred millions of dollars was taken out of training for the Army in Europe and put into family housing, in taking care of the troops there. But when we cut back on training, that cuts back on readiness. I think that this is a measure in the right direction. I wish the gentleman well.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I can say that no one has a higher credibility in this House of Representatives than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. May I inquire of the Chair how much time we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I simply want to again point out that this bill has nothing whatsoever to do with whether servicemen will or will not get their pay raise. As the gentleman knows, they will get their pay raise whether the Obey amendment passes or not. They have already gotten it. The only question is, Will the money to reimburse the Pentagon for that pay raise come from low-priority defense projects, including pork projects, or will it come from other domestic programs which are cut?

They already have their pay raise. Your bill does not change that, my amendment does not change that, and we both know it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I have to say to the gentleman that I disagree, that in our additions for readiness, we specifically mention the amount of money that would pay for the .6 percent of the pay raise that we did not fund.

If we do not appropriate this money and fund that additional amount, then

grant that the troops already have their pay raise and will continue to get their pay raise? Is that not the truth? It is and you know it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. But it has come at the expense of training, which is readiness.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We are trying to be honest with the Pentagon and honest with the troops and appropriate the money that we have directed the Pentagon to spend for pay increases.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for making that clear. They are getting the pay raise.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat that the Obey amendment does not specify any of this. We are up front. We are honest. We have given you the target to look at. We have listed item by item by item for rescission, we have listed item by item for inclusion in the bill. This is an up-front, genuine, sincere effort to make sure that our military forces have what they need for quality of life and to be trained for readiness.

The minority leader spoke eloquently here on the floor just a few minutes ago and he says we are not voting on the details of this bill today. I disagree with that. We are going to vote here in a few minutes on the details of the Obey substitute. Following that, we are going to vote on the details of this bill.

Do not try to read anything else into it. We have been up front, we have been very specific. You know what the details are.

He mentioned also that this has come after passing the balanced budget amendment, and that is true, but what he failed to say was this money was spent before this Congress ever convened. This money was spent. We are paying it back. That is the only responsible thing to do.

We could have sat back and waited and not done anything, let the administration push and cry and shove. We decided that was not the responsible way to do this. In fact, we had to pull them to get them to send down their requests for the supplemental. In fact, we marked this up on the 27th day of January and did not get their request until February 6. So we are pulling and expediting this emergency supplemental.

The minority leader also mentioned corrupting the system. I am not exactly sure what he meant there. I think that fits into the category of holy pictures. He talked about a flash of red ink. Our numbers again are specific. The numbers of the gentleman ers, the regimental commanders, the colonels and the generals and you ask them what is the problem with readiness and they will give you a many-page report on where readiness is short. We have denied readiness requirements dealing with flying hours and training and steaming and spare parts and ammunition accounts and things of this nature. The fact is we could spend a lot more to make our readiness more ready.

I want to make this last point. Readiness today is one issue. Readiness this time next year is something else, and readiness this time 5 years from now is something else again. What we do today not only deals with today's readiness but also next year and 5 years down the road and maybe even 10 years down the road.

We have an important responsibility today. I am satisfied that we are going to do it properly and we are going to vote against the unspecific Obey substitute and we are going to vote for the bipartisan committee bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Let me just simply ask a question. Clearly there are many of us who think the Federal Government should be able to respond to emergencies, whether they are international or domestic. Clearly the House said ''no'' when we adopted the balanced budget amendment. I am just curious what your judgment is for the future. We are wrapped up in this discussion now in its consistency, and I clearly think the Obey amendment is consistent with the balanced budget amendment. But let us project to the future. Let us assume that the decision is made that we need to deploy troops, whether it is made by the President as Commander in Chief or whether it is made by Congress.

How will that deployment be paid for in the future and what kind of procedure does Congress have to do to make that decision in the future under that amendment?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. As the gentleman well knows, there is a proposal from the Department of Defense that we should consider that would deal with that very issue, how do you give the Pentagon flexibility to pay for these kind of contingency operations. But the best answer is this. If there is going to be a major contingency operation, a deployment of U.S. troops, the President should consult with the Congress and the Congress should be a player, because now we are having to

□ 1510

Now as far as the gentleman's suggestion that there might be a better way, there might be. We will monitor that very closely as we go through the fiscal year 1996 process.

Mr. SABO. Would I not be right in saying that if we follow that amendment, 50 percent of the Congress could choose to deploy troops but it would require 60 percent of the House and the Senate to raise the debt ceiling to pay for the deployment of those troops.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is a hypothetical question, and what I am saying to the gentleman is we do not affect the balanced budget with this bill because we are paying for the bill with specifics. I realize there are disagreements, but tell me how many outlays would we save with the Obey substitute next year or the year after, can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. SABO. The Obey substitute requires, Mr. Chairman, the Obey substitute requires that the outlays be there to pay for it. The amendment clearly increases outlays by about $288 billion in the current fiscal year and about $600 billion over 5 years.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield back to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman. I think that the gentleman has explained his case. I would hope that we could break this off and get to a vote.

I yield back to the gentleman to wrap it up.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida. We have a crisis here. We have to replenish these accounts or we are not going to have money in the fourth quarter for the readiness of our troops. Anybody can vote whatever way they want on the Obey amendment, but we have to pass this supplemental. So we will have our vote on Obey. But I want to compliment the gentleman for being out in front trying to get this thing done, because if we do not get it done by the end of this, we are in serious trouble in terms of readiness of our troops. The Comptroller called me this morning and said, NORM, we have got to get this thing through the House. So let us vote on this after we vote on the Obey substitute.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and commend him for his support.

pired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 260, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No 152]

AYES—167

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Olver
Ackerman	Gutknecht	Orton
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Owens
Baesler	Hamilton	Pallone
Barcia	Harman	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Hilliard	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Poshard
Bonior	Jacobs	Rahall
Boucher	Jefferson	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Rivers
Bryant (TX)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Cardin	Kaptur	Rose
Chapman	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Clayton	Kildee	Sanders
Clyburn	Kleczka	Sawyer
Coleman	LaFalce	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Schumer
Collins (MI)	Levin	Serrano
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Costello	Lincoln	Slaughter
Coyne	Lipinski	Smith (MI)
Danner	Lofgren	Spratt
Deal	Lowey	Stark
DeFazio	Luther	Stokes
DeLauro	Maloney	Studds
Dellums	Manton	Stupak
Deutsch	Markey	Thompson
Dingell	Martinez	Thornton
Doggett	Matsui	Thurman
Doyle	McCarthy	Torres
Durbin	McDermott	Torricelli
Engel	McHale	Towns
Eshoo	McKinney	Traficant
Evans	McNulty	Velazquez
Farr	Meehan	Vento
Fazio	Menendez	Visclosky
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Volkmer
Filner	Miller (CA)	Ward
Flake	Mineta	Waters
Ford	Minge	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Mink	Waxman
Frost	Moakley	Williams
Furse	Moran	Wise
Gejdenson	Morella	Woolsey
Gephardt	Nadler	Wyden
Gibbons	Neal	Wynn
Gordon	Oberstar	Yates
Green	Obey	

NOES—260

Allard	Baldacci	Bass
Archer	Ballenger	Bateman
Armey	Barr	Bereuter
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Bilbray
Baker (CA)	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Baker (LA)	Barton	Bliley
Burton	Heineman	Radanovich
Buyer	Herger	Ramstad
Callahan	Hilleary	Regula
Calvert	Hobson	Richardson
Camp	Hoekstra	Riggs
Canady	Hoke	Roberts
Castle	Horn	Rogers
Chabot	Hostettler	Rohrabacher
Chambliss	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Chenoweth	Hunter	Roth
Christensen	Hutchinson	Roukema
Chrysler	Hyde	Royce
Clement	Inglis	Salmon
Clinger	Istook	Sanford
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Collins (GA)	Jones	Schaefer
Combest	Kasich	Schiff
Condit	Kelly	Scott
Cooley	Kennelly	Seastrand
Cox	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	King	Shadegg
Crane	Kingston	Shaw
Crapo	Klink	Shays
Cremeans	Klug	Shuster
Cubin	Knollenberg	Sisisky
Cunningham	Kolbe	Skeen
Davis	LaHood	Skelton
de la Garza	Largent	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Latham	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Dickey	Laughlin	Solomon
Dicks	Lazio	Souder
Dixon	Leach	Spence
Dooley	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Stenholm
Dornan	Lightfoot	Stockman
Dreier	Linder	Stump
Duncan	Livingston	Talent
Dunn	LoBiondo	Tanner
Edwards	Longley	Tate
Ehrlich	Lucas	Tauzin
Emerson	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
English	Martini	Taylor (NC)
Ensign	Mascara	Tejeda
Everett	McCollum	Thomas
Ewing	McCrery	Thornberry
Fawell	McDade	Tiahrt
Fields (TX)	McHugh	Torkildsen
Flanagan	McInnis	Upton
Foglietta	McIntosh	Vucanovich
Foley	McKeon	Waldholtz
Forbes	Metcalf	Walker
Fowler	Meyers	Walsh
Fox	Mica	Wamp
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Franks (NJ)	Molinari	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mollohan	Weldon (PA)
Frisa	Montgomery	Weller
Funderburk	Moorhead	White
Gallegly	Murtha	Whitfield
Ganske	Myers	Wicker
Gekas	Myrick	Wilson
Geren	Nethercutt	Wolf
Gilchrest	Neumann	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Ney	Young (FL)
Gilman	Norwood	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Nussle	Zimmer
Goodling	Ortiz	

NOT VOTING—7

Browder	Gonzalez	Tucker
Ehlers	Meek	
Fattah	Rush	

□ 1529

Messrs. ALLARD, SCOTT, and DOOLEY changed their vote from ‘‘aye’’ to ‘‘no.’’

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a sub-

ERSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 92, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill H.R. 889 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House with amendments so as to ensure that discretionary outlays for fiscal year 1995 that are made pursuant to new budget authority in the bill do not cause discretionary outlays for fiscal year 1995 (computed without regard to any emergency designations in the bill) to exceed the amount currently allocated to the Committee on Appropriations pursuant to section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, the House has just refused to make this bill deficit-neutral. It has, in effect, voted to add $282 million to the deficit in this fiscal year and $644 million to the deficit over the next 5 years.

Having failed at the effort to bring this bill into neutrality on the deficit, I am trying to do the second best thing.‘

What I am trying to do in the motion to recommit is at least say that this bill will not be allowed to breach the

According to CBO, the total of 1995 appropriations enacted to date is only $135 million under the 1995 outlay cap in the 1995 budget resolution. After subtracting all of the cuts, this bill still adds $282 million to outlay spending for 1995. That means it breaks the budget resolution cap by $147 million.

All this motion does is to tell the committee to go back and scrub the bill to find that extra $147 million so that you do not break the budget cap that all of you told your constituents in the last election was already too high.

If you want to balance the budget, if you have any commitment at all to balancing the budget, you have no choice but to vote for this recommittal motion. Otherwise you will not be balancing the budget, you will be busting the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, the former chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Wisconsin telling me that the bill in its current form would spend $147 million more than the discretionary spending caps we set in 1995?

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman is correct. It breaks the budget to the tune of $147 million.

Mr. SABO. So, the first spending bill which this new Congress is considering will exceed the discretionary spending caps in the budget resolution of 1995?

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman has got it.

Mr. SABO. I am surprised.

Mr. OBEY. I am not.

Let me simply say: What this means is that in the very first financial bill that you are voting on, after you told the country you were going to balance the budget by voting for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, you are going to vote to bust the budget and add $147 million to our spending for this fiscal year.

If this is what you are going to do in the first bill that you vote on after you have voted for that constitutional amendment, I am very interested to see what the deficit is going to look like after you vote on the rest of the items in the contract.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

□ 1540

But of we agreed with him, if his motion to recommit passed the House, this would effectively send this bill back to committee to find an additional $282 million in cuts. Never mind that we have come up with $1.46 billion in defense cuts, never mind that we have come up with $1.4 billion in foreign aid and domestic cuts, all in budget authority. Mr. OBEY says that he is not satisfied. He is not satisfied even though most of the people that are voting for his motion to recommit, most of the people that voted for his substitute, voted to put our troops into Haiti, and most of us on this side voted against it. Now they do not want to restore the money that was expended in Haiti and all of those other places where this President detailed our troops, and this now has cut short our ability to train and maintain the forces of the United States.

Mr. Obey's own substitute——

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction on one number?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to complete my statement.

The fact is we have come up with a bill that has $14 million more in cuts compared to the amount of money we want to spend. We are rescinding in budget authority an amount equal, and then some, compared to the amount we are spending. Mr. OBEY's motion to recommit, does not do this.

Now look at the calendar. The fact is that within a couple of weeks we are going to be asking for some monumental rescissions, and we will hope that all of the people who have sounded so interested in balancing the budget will join with us and vote for all of the cuts that are coming out of the subcommittees today, tomorrow, and Fridays. Some $10 billion, perhaps $15 billion, in rescissions are coming out of those subcommittees, and I hope that all of my colleagues will vote for every one of those cuts.

I say to my colleagues, ''Whether you do that or not, sending this bill back to the committee puts it off the table for now. It denies the Defense Department the needed funds for operations, and I'm sorry that it gives Mr. OBEY another bite at the apple because we would have to revisit this bill in the context of a larger rescission bill.''

This is an emergency, and the motion to recommit is a bad idea. It is bad for the national security of the Nation. It undercuts the responsible cuts the committee has made to pay for this bill, it ties the needed supplemental funds up unnecessarily, and I urge every question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 264, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

AYES—163

Abercrombie	Gordon	Pastor
Ackerman	Green	Payne (NJ)
Andrews	Gutierrez	Payne (VA)
Baesler	Hall (OH)	Pelosi
Barcia	Hamilton	Peterson (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Beilenson	Hinchey	Poshard
Bentsen	Holden	Rahall
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Bishop	Jacobs	Reed
Bonior	Jefferson	Reynolds
Borski	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Rose
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Cardin	Kildee	Sanders
Chapman	Kleczka	Sawyer
Clay	LaFalce	Schroeder
Clayton	Lantos	Schumer
Clement	Levin	Serrano
Clyburn	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Coleman	Lincoln	Slaughter
Collins (IL)	Lipinski	Spratt
Collins (MI)	Lofgren	Stark
Conyers	Lowey	Stenholm
Costello	Luther	Stokes
Coyne	Maloney	Studds
Danner	Manton	Stupak
Deal	Markey	Thompson
DeFazio	Martinez	Thornton
DeLauro	Matsui	Thurman
Dellums	McCarthy	Torres
Deutsch	McDermott	Torricelli
Dingell	McKinney	Towns
Dixon	McNulty	Traficant
Doggett	Meehan	Tucker
Doyle	Menendez	Velazquez
Durbin	Mfume	Vento
Engel	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Eshoo	Mineta	Volkmer
Evans	Minge	Ward
Fazio	Mink	Waters
Fields (LA)	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Filner	Moran	Waxman
Flake	Nadler	Williams
Ford	Neal	Wise
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Woolsey
Frost	Obey	Wyden
Furse	Olver	Wynn
Gejdenson	Orton	Yates
Gephardt	Owens	
Gibbons	Pallone	

NOES—264

Allard	Bass	Brewster
Archer	Bateman	Brownback
Armey	Bereuter	Bryant (TN)
Bachus	Bevill	Bunn
Baker (CA)	Bilbray	Bunning
Baker (LA)	Bilirakis	Burr
Baldacci	Bliley	Burton
Ballenger	Blute	Buyer
Barr	Boehlert	Callahan
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Calvert
Bartlett	Bonilla	Camp
Barton	Bono	Canady

Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Browder
Ehlers
Farr
Fattah
Gonzalez
Meek
Rush

☐ 1600

Mr. HOKE changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—165

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Clayton
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gephardt
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McKinney
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Blute
Browder
Ehlers
Fattah
Gonzalez
Meek
Rush

☐ 1618

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on final passage of H.R. 889, making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions. Had I been present I would have voted ''aye.''

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

☐ 1620

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call