

There is no evidence that the incidence of fraud is decreasing. In fact, with the increasing complexity of financial deals and the instruments used to consummate these transactions, the SEC's missions are more and more vital.

In addition, the Senate bill abolishes the SEC's office of investor education and assistance. This office is the only place where individual investors can get their complaints resolved without resorting to litigation. The steady rise in the stock market is due, in part, to the fact of an increasing number of individual investors placing their funds there. Do we really want to eliminate the only Government entity that offers these investors the ability to have their complaints resolved without costly court action?

Part of the reason for the Senate action is given that it is based upon this notion that the States should perform this task, that the States should take over part of this responsibility. That is simply not practical in this context, and it is yet another example of piling additional responsibilities on States and not funding those responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the stability and the integrity of the American financial markets is of paramount importance. I do not think that the Members of the other body were fully aware of the impacts of their action when this bill was passed in a rather chaotic moment just before the last recess.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the chairman of the subcommittee is prepared to accept the motion. I have discussed it with him.

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

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

I will be brief. I have no objection to this motion to instruct the conferees, to insist on the House position on the Securities and Exchange Commission. I believe it will help resolve this issue in conference.

The House position maintains overall funding for the SEC at the fiscal 1995 level, \$297 million, instead of a 10-percent cut as proposed by the Senate. The House maintains the current fee structure while the Senate reduces fees. As a result, the Senate appropriates \$31.5 million more than the House and yet reduces overall funding by 10 percent.

In short, the Senate bill pays more to get less.

The House position, on the other hand, is a bipartisan position that has resulted from extensive cooperation among the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Appropriations. It represents a coordinated approach to sustain the SEC while gradually reducing reliance on fees.

The House approach was most recently endorsed by the Washington Post in an editorial last Sunday.

So I will support the motion offered by the gentleman, my colleague, and I would urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROGERS, KOLBE, TAYLOR of North Carolina, REGULA, FORBES, LIVINGSTON, MOLLOHAN, SKAGGS, DIXON, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1500

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 2076, the matter just considered.

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

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2126, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996.

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

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a further conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2126, be instructed to reduce within the scope of conference total spending by \$3 billion compared to the amount provided in the House bill to be derived from deleting funds for low priority "Procurement", Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation" and other projects contained in the House or Senate bills that were not included in the President's Budget: *Provided*, That the conferees shall not reduce military pay or Operation and Maintenance readiness activities below the levels provided in the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, my motion to instruct conferees is fairly straightforward. It simply asks the conferees to delete \$3 billion worth of pork which the conferees placed into this bill.

Every Member who has told his or her constituents that they want to change business as usual in Congress ought to enthusiastically support this motion. It simply instructs conferees to bring back a new conference report that cuts \$3 billion in pork projects that do not affect readiness and do not affect military pay or operation and maintenance when they bring the bill back to the House.

The motion is very simple. It would save \$3 billion. As Everett Dirksen used to say, "That is real money."

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be useful to review a little recent history to put all of this into context. Earlier this year we heard an awful lot of scare talk about how it was vital to our national interests to add another \$7 billion to the Pentagon's quarter of a trillion dollar budget request in order to protect the readiness of our Armed Forces. Who could be against that?

The House leadership told us that this \$7 billion was so essential and of such high priority that it had to be done, even if in the process it required other areas of the budget to apply draconian reductions to America's senior citizens, to working families, to workers who needed training, to America's kids. As a result, over the last 3 months, this Congress has produced one of the meanest and most extreme budget proposals that has been produced in the history of the Congress, to pay for more military spending and to provide huge tax cuts, over 50 percent of which go to the wealthiest people in our society.

Compassion for the sick and elderly has been thrown out the window; concern for clean drinking water and clean air has evidently evaporated; investments in the education of our children and in job training for workers tossed out of work have been severely savaged; summer jobs for lots of kids in

this society have been eliminated; cops are being taken off the street as fast as they were put on it last year; and what are we getting for all of this sacrifice in the military budget?

Well, that question was answered several weeks ago when the first Defense appropriations conference report, which this House voted down, correctly, was first produced. That gives us a clear picture of what the new leadership of this Congress feels is the top priority. The headline that should have accompanied the conference report on that bill is "Pork Replaces Readiness."

Now, where did that \$7 billion go? It did not go to the troops. The critical readiness account in the conference report operation and maintenance was actually lower than it was in the Clinton budget by nearly half a billion dollars, after you take out non-DOD items, like the \$300 million in Coast Guard funding that comes under the Transportation bill, the \$260 million in inflation cuts which should have been credited to both the President's budget as well as the House budget, because it is merely an estimate, and \$650 million in contingency financing.

So in real, practical terms, the operation and maintenance account is half a billion dollars lower, not higher, than President Clinton's budget was. Yet the bill produced by this committee put the entire \$7 billion into pet procurement projects that the Pentagon did not even ask for and says they do not need right now.

If you do not believe me, if you do not believe a Wisconsin progressive, then why not take the word of a pro-defense conservative Republican Senator. I have a letter from Senator McCAIN which every one of us has received, and that letter lists some 100 projects, some 100 pieces of pork, which in his estimate, by conservative standards, will cost the taxpayers \$4.1 billion in unnecessary spending. That does not even count the unnecessary funding for star wars and two extra \$1 billion ships.

My motion does not go nearly as far as Senator McCAIN suggested that we go. It simply says cut \$3 billion, rather than the \$4.1 billion that the Senator identified.

Mr. Speaker, if Members are against pork, they ought to vote for this motion. If they are against corporate welfare, they ought to vote for this motion. If Members are for deficit reduction, they ought to vote for this motion. If anybody wants to see the list that the good Senator provided us, I am more than willing to show, and we have got some additional projects as well which we are willing to talk to people about, including projects put in these bills by some people who on Tuesday will talk about how much they are saving the taxpayer in the defense bill and then on Thursday will slip in extra items that raise the cost of everything from Navy construction projects to you name it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and urge every Member to

read what the good Senator has said about the unnecessary pork items in this bill before you vote on this motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would start by saying here we go again. The House overwhelmingly defeated an attempt to reduce the House bill when it was on the floor in its initial stages. This is a rehashing of the same approach. The conference report did reduce the House bill. We expect that the conference report numbers would be about the same, but let me tell you where they are.

If we were to accept the Obey motion to instruct and if it were to prevail, this bill for fiscal year 1996 would be \$2.6 billion less than the defense bill that was signed into law last year, which would mean the 12th year in a row that our investment in our national security has been reduced. It would result in a defense appropriations bill which would be \$5.2 billion less than the House-passed defense authorization bill.

So we are talking about a very fiscally conservative defense bill. What we are trying to do, we are trying to change the direction. Our defense establishment has already been reduced by 1.2 million personnel. At the same time, the President, the Commander in Chief, is sending U.S. troops around the world. If anybody is paying any attention at all, they know that the President intends to send 20,000 to 25,000 more American troops to Bosnia. To do what? To keep the peace? They do not call this peacekeeping forces anymore. Now they call it the implementation force. They are supposedly going with full combat gear and heavy equipment.

My attitude is if the U.S. troops are going to be deployed to a hostile situation, that is the way they ought to go. But if they are going like that, that means there is no peace to keep. It means they are there to implement the peace. According to the news media this morning, the President has no intention of coming to the Congress to get any approval on the part of the Congress for this deployment of U.S. troops. I say that is wrong, Mr. President. The Congress has not only a right, but an obligation to be involved in these kind of decisions.

Now, what type of programs would we have to eliminate if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] were successful? What are the low priority, unrequested additions?

First, let me speak to the issue of what is unrequested. Everyone who knows what is going on in this business, in the Congress and outside the Congress, at the Pentagon, at the White House, understands that the President sets a budget number. Regardless of what the Department of Defense, the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps, what they think they need to accomplish their missions, they have to work with-

in that political number set by the President.

We tried to do our work a little differently. We had in the war fighters, not the political Pentagon but the people who have to perform the missions, who have to go to places like Bosnia or who went to Somalia or Desert Storm, to find out what their needs are. We came up with quite a list. I know that the gentleman who preceded me does not like it when I bring out this scroll, and I will not roll it out again, but this scroll contains hundreds of items that the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps have identified as critical issues for them, but they could not get them in the budget because the number was not there.

We are trying to turn that corner. We are trying to change the direction of 11 years of reduction, year after year, in our national defense activities, and that is what is on this scroll. We have tried to provide some of those. They are on the list.

Let me speak to what some of those are. What are the unrequested adds? I hope the Members will pay attention to this, because almost every Member in this Chamber has written to me or spoken to me about this issue: \$100 million that we added to this bill for breast cancer treatment and research for those women who serve in the military and the spouses of the men who serve in the military who may at one time or another have to deal with the issue of breast cancer.

We were asked to provide \$300 million for the military, the military activities, of the U.S. Coast Guard. While they do not come under our jurisdiction for their total funding, they are a military organization, and they are essential to our Nation's security. So we added \$300 million for the Coast Guard.

We added \$322 million for barracks renovation, because some of the conditions of some of the barracks that our soldiers have to live in are pathetic. We are trying to correct that.

We provided additional money for the Guard and Reserve equipment, because the Guard and Reserve, as we have reduced the end strength of our Armed Forces, the Guard and Reserve become extremely more important. Secretary Perry told us just a few days ago that when the troops go to Bosnia there will be Guard and Reserve units that will go with those troops that go to Bosnia.

□ 1515

So they need to be properly equipped. And we tried to bring them up to date by modernizing their equipment.

And, yes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] does not like this one at all, but we did provide extra money for ballistic missile defense.

I remember going to Saudi Arabia during Operation Desert Storm with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JACK MURTHA, who was then chairman of this subcommittee, and shortly after we returned from that war zone we learned that a Scud missile had killed

a large number of Pennsylvania National Guardsmen who were asleep in their barracks because our missile defense was not as good as it ought to be. It is still not, and we are trying to improve that.

Mr. Speaker, we want to make sure when our troops are deployed and they go to sleep in their barracks behind the war zone that they ought to be provided some protection against a Scud type missile or an incoming ballistic missile.

We provided some extra money for trucks. I visited some army bases just recently and I saw trucks that were in service in the Army when President Truman was President of the United States. It costs more to keep them up than it does to replace them, so we are trying to replace some of those World War II vintage trucks.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many of us remember General Schwarzkopf's comments when he came back from Desert Storm as a conquering hero, but he made the point to our subcommittee and to anybody that would listen that without the trucks that he had, that incidentally the Pentagon had never asked for but Congress provided, without those trucks he could never have prosecuted that war to the extent that he did.

Mr. Speaker, we had a \$400 million shortfall in ammunition. Ammunition. We provided extra money for ammunition.

Something else we did that was an initiative of our subcommittee. There is an ongoing operation in Iraq to deny access to the skies of the Iraqi fighter pilots. That is ongoing. We added \$650 million to pay for that operation.

The way it has always been done in the past, Mr. Speaker, the President just goes ahead, he deploys the troops, and at the end of the year we have to come up with a supplemental to pay for that. We knew how much this operation was going to cost and so we provided the \$650 million over and above the President's request to pay for that operation. And if we did not do that, what happens? They have to borrow it from their training accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now move on to the subject of Bosnia because that is exactly what is happening today. The operation in Bosnia, before any additional deployment, is going to cost over \$300 million this fiscal year. That money is being borrowed from their training accounts; and, as the Bosnian situation develops and grows more serious and more expensive, the moneys are going to be borrowed from training, from readiness, from operations and maintenance. We took a first step toward correcting some of that problem here with this money for the unbudgeted contingencies.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington, who happens to be a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a minute here to join the gentleman in urging the House to vote against this instruction.

I have great respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has been a good friend of mine for many years, and I understand his point of view. And many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle have difficulty with the budget priorities that are being presented to us in the reconciliation package and in the appropriations bills. But as someone who has served on this subcommittee for 17 years, I would like to remind my colleagues that we have reduced defense spending since 1985.

Mr. Speaker, if we took this year's budget and put it back into 1985 dollars, it would be about \$350 billion. That was kind of the high point of the Reagan defense buildup. Since then we have cut that budget from \$350 billion down to \$250. Now, show me any other area of Government where we have made those kinds of cuts. It is about a 37 percent reduction in real terms.

I would also point out that that 1985 budget defense spending included about \$135 billion for procurement. That procurement budget has now been cut down to \$41 billion a year, a 70-percent reduction, which, I think, is going to be the next major problem that we face in the defense area.

Mr. Speaker, people talk about readiness. We are spending a lot of money on readiness. Where we are not spending the money properly, in my judgment, is in procuring the new weapon systems to replace the equipment that we have in each of our services. I think that this \$3 billion cut, coming at a time when this administration is going to be asking us to come up with money for Bosnia on top of it, would be a serious mistake in judgment.

I would support my chairman here. I think we have to support what the committee did on a very bipartisan basis. Yes, we can look at Senator MCCAIN's list. I do not like a lot of the things that were in there, but I would point out that most of them came from the other body. We go into those conferences and we have to deal with these issues, and the ones that the chairman has pointed out are very important and he has done his level best to keep the bill as free of unnecessary spending as he can. And yet we are doing some things in the health area, like breast cancer, which I think, overwhelmingly, the House and the country would support.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope we can resist this motion to instruct and remember the context. We have already cut defense way back. We have cut force structure by a third. We have a much smaller military today than we did just a few years ago, and it is the one area in Government where we have really made, over a substantial period of time, real reductions. At this point I think we have to level that off or we are going to do considerable damage to

the readiness and the ability of this country to defend itself.

I appreciate the chairman yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 23 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 18 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and note that the gentleman from Florida has indicated that in my remarks I am doing nothing but rehashing old arguments. That is absolutely correct, and I intend to rehash those arguments again and again and again and again and again until people stop listening to baffle and start facing some true facts.

We have heard about the draconian reductions in the U.S. military budget. My question is: In comparison to what? This chart shows a red bar representing the Russian military budget since the Soviet Union collapsed, and the blue bar is representing the United States budget since that time. This shows the comparative reductions in military spending by the Soviet Union and the United States.

As we can see by the rapid decline in the red bars, the Russians have reduced their military spending since the Berlin Wall fell by about 70 percent. The United States, represented by these blue bars, has reduced our military budget by about 10 percent over that same time period.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest this hardly indicates that somebody is going to get you. It hardly indicates that we are about to be swarmed over by the red hordes or any other hordes in the world.

This chart shows how our military budget compares to that of all our potential adversaries. If we take Russia, if we take China, if we take Syria, Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea, Cuba, that military powerhouse, Cuba, if we take them all and add them together and compare them to what the United States spends in the rest of the pie chart, we spend about 2½ times as much as all of our potential adversaries put together.

Mr. Speaker, third point. We take the good old B-2. We are only buying twice as many B-2's as the Pentagon asked for at a cost of \$1.2 billion a crack. Just the cost of one of those airplanes would pay the tuition for every single undergraduate student at the University of Wisconsin for the next 12 years. That puts it in perspective. Just two B-2 bombers.

If we just decided not to spend the money for those two B-2 bombers, we could restore \$1.2 billion in cuts for education; we could provide \$1 billion

□ 1530

for home heating help that has been cut out of the budget, to help 6 million households; we could provide summer jobs for 300,000 kids, all with just what we are going to spend to buy two of those B-2 bombers.

This committee, however, in its infinite wisdom, says "Oh, oh, oh, we have to buy them, baby, because somebody wants them." The gentleman from Florida says that there are other items that some people in the Pentagon would like. Well, then, I suggest that they ought to get those items through the Pentagon's process, because right now the Pentagon itself has turned down the items that I am trying to eliminate in this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a bit surprised there is some general or some admiral who will come to us and whisper behind us and say: "Hey, I have to have this. Really would like this." Of course, they do. Have any of us ever met a bureaucrat in any profession, military or otherwise, who did not have his hand out for something that he would like that the country cannot afford? Wake up, fellas. Wake up.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks about what General Schwarzkopf said about the need for some equipment. The general I prefer to listen to in this case is named Eisenhower, and he warned us a long time ago of the pernicious effect on the ability of this Congress to control spending that is created when we have the huge military industrial complex that goes to work and decides that they are going to build a weapon system by putting projects in 48 of the 50 States so that they create pressure on virtually every single congressional delegation to vote for something even though it is not needed.

Mr. Speaker, having said all that, I want to say that is not what is at issue here today. What is at issue here today is whether or not we are going to take over \$4 billion in pork. Capital P-O-R-K, pork. If we are going to take \$4 billion in pork and knock out three-quarters of it. I am not even asking that we knock it all out. You can keep your favorite items. We can get together and decide how we are going to divvy up the rest but knock out three-quarters of, not what I say is pork, but what Senator McCAIN says is pork. And the last time I looked, he is not exactly a left wing antidefenser.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we keep this in perspective and remember that this amendment does not attack the defense of the country and it does not attack the military preparedness of the country. All it says is, "Boys and girls, take three-quarters of the pork out of the bill." That is all it says. It does not even single out which items should be taken out. It leaves it up to the committee and their great expertise.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the ranking minority member on the subcommittee and a former chairman.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me talk about some of the comments that the ranking member of the full committee made and the concern I have about passing instructions to reduce the amount of money available to the Defense Department.

When I was just over in Bosnia over the weekend, I found that they are using some of the money from the next quarter already and we are trying to sort out exactly how the money should be spent. Now, what we have done this year is try to make adjustments in the various programs that the Defense Department has asked for. For instance, over the years, we have put language in the bill, or we have put a number of programs in the bill that have been absolutely essential to the national security of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I remember well, probably 15 years ago, when a number of us offered an amendment to put SL-7's in. The Navy did not want it. The Defense Department did not want it. It took us 2 or 3 years before we could get that legislation through. As a matter of fact, we passed the legislation and in the gulf war, it was essential, since 95 percent of the materiel that was sent over to Saudi Arabia went by ship, much of it went by these SL-7's, which are large cargo-carrying vessels.

We do adjust what the Defense Department asks for. That is our job. Our job is to try and set the priorities for the Defense Department. Now, we are going to go back to conference. We are going to look at all the things, the adjustments that the Members have asked for, the concern that they have about the various issues, and if I remember on the floor, there was an amendment to reduce defense in the initial phase, before the conference, by 5 percent, by 3 percent. Both of those were defeated substantially.

I believe we have the right mix. I have talked to a number of people in the Defense Department, and they think we have the right mix. I disagree with the gentleman from Wisconsin who said that the members in the military are looking for a handout. I believe very strongly that they serve with dedication. They try to get the most for their money. They do not ask for money unless they feel they need it. They feel that it is essential that our troops be prepared for the type action they may be sent into.

We have got a concern about the deployment to Bosnia. We want to make sure that any troops that are sent there are prepared. We want to make sure they have the most modern weapons possible. We made the decision on the B-2. The House made the decision on the B-2; made the decision that we

need that modern weapons system in order to save money in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I was the one that offered, years ago, an amendment to jump over the B-1 and go to the B-2, because I felt the B-1 was obsolete at that time. It was defeated on the floor of the House. I accepted the fact that it was defeated on the floor of the House, and I predicted that it would be very difficult for us to build a number of B-2's, but we are now in a position where we found the money to fund the B-2. We cut intelligence. We found that there was extra money that had not been used and could not be used and was not obligated in the intelligence sector that we could put into this issue.

One of the major weaknesses in the Navy Department right now is the fact they have not bought the modern airplanes. We are not going to have airplanes that are stealthy. Our airplanes are slower than they were in Vietnam. Even though some of them are modern, an awful lot of them, the bombers in particular are not only not modern, but they are antiquated and very susceptible to ground fire. So, we are now in the process of trying to upgrade the Navy Department.

The B-2 plays a part in that. The military leaders themselves feel that the F-22 is an essential part of the defense of this great country. If we allow this equipment to become antiquated, we become vulnerable and we start to lose lives. We found 50 years ago that 50 percent of the aircraft were deadlined because of the lack of spare parts. We have tried to take care of that. We have tried to reach the delicate balance of continued research and development, spare parts and readiness.

Mr. Speaker, we sat in hearings for 5 months. Hours and hours of hearings, trying to make sure we made the right decisions. This bill came out of committee, adjusted between the House and the Senate, with what we felt was something that the White House could sign.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that this bill, with a very minimal change, will be signed by the White House at some point. We will have to make some changes, but I would urge the Members to defeat the motion to instruct by the gentleman from Wisconsin and let us go to conference and work it out.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard, "Oh, we cannot cut this bill because we are going to endanger items important to national security."

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues would take a look at Senator McCAIN's list: Electric vehicles research, brown tree snake research, wastewater treatment plan for a community, a small business development center for another community, national solar observatory, a natural gas boiler demonstration project, Mississippi resource development center. That hardly sounds to me like these are crucial defense items.

Mr. Speaker, I could name a lot more, and will, if pressed. But it just seems to me that, as I said earlier, I am not even insisting that we take the Senator's full \$4 billion list of pork. I am suggesting that we ought to take three-quarters of it and take it out of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would make another point. What I said, and my colleagues can go back and check the record, what I said was that there is not a bureaucrat, be they in the military or elsewhere, who does not have his hand out for something that the country cannot afford. I stand by that statement. I have too much experience around here to know anything other than that.

Mr. Speaker, those bureaucrats come into our offices every day from the military, from universities, from you name it. There is not an agency of this government that does not have its hand out for something, trying to get around the budget limitations put on that agency by the President of the United States and the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would make another point. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] says, Well, you know, we are going to have future contingencies that we have to pay for. I would be willing to buy an amendment right here and now which takes \$3 billion out of the pork and put it right into the contingency fund. If the gentleman wants to offer that, I would be happy to accept it and start over with the motion to recommit.

So, let us not kid ourselves that this money is here for contingencies. This money is here because there has been a political accommodation reached to try to fund projects which the Pentagon says are not necessary. I do not suggest that the Pentagon in all cases is right. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is perfectly correct. That there are some instances in which we need to exceed what any agency asks for, and we have heard a number of those cases made during the Iraqi war, for instance. I agree with that observation.

That is why this amendment does not call for the elimination of all pork. It does call for the elimination of three-quarters of it, because that is the only way I know how, that is the only way I know how to break up the insider dealing, which otherwise is going to prevent us from really forcing the tough questions.

Because as all of my colleagues know, the great hidden secret in our military budget is that while in the 7-year period overall, this budget that the Congress has produced would spend more than the President, after the seventh year, it spends less than the President is suggesting. The fact is that there is no way we are going to be able to keep to that outyear glidepath to take us down to those lower numbers unless we start eliminating some of the waste up front, right now.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to be on this floor tomorrow and we are going to be asked to cut Medicare benefits. We are going to be asked next week to gut the protection of the middle-class families when one in their family has to go to a nursing home. We are going to be asked to take major reductions in education, 30 to 40 percent reductions in job training, but we are being told that we cannot afford to cut this \$3 billion in pork? Baloney.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, first, let me applaud anyone who wants to save money in this body. But there are bigger issues at stake on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on National Security and today Secretary of State Christopher came before the committee and said it was his opinion that he could commit 25,000 American troops to the most dangerous place in the world without congressional approval.

If my colleagues happen to have read the Constitution, article I, section 8 gives that responsibility to send young Americans off to war solely to the Congress.

And this is a war. They would be sent in, allegedly, as peacekeepers to a part of the world where the best-armed people consider us to be their enemies, because we have bombed them repeatedly in the last month or so.

This body, led by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] with the help of the entire body, passed a measure that would prohibit the President from spending funds on ground forces in that portion of the world without congressional authority. That is our job. We cannot run away from it.

One of the reasons that the majority defeated the defense appropriations bill conference report was because that language had been removed after the House voted for it unanimously. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] is the chairman of that subcommittee. I would like to know what the gentleman's feelings are going to be entering this conference as far as trying to put that language back into the bill, because as the gentleman knows, under the rules of the House there will be very few avenues for a Member of the House to vote on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House has spoken on this, and I think it is very important that we stick to the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and the many others who passed that amendment unanimously.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments the gentleman has made and I know of the gentleman's strong interest.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I could not agree with him more with the issue that he raises dealing with the President sending United States troops to Bosnia. As a matter of fact, in the bill that I presented as the chairman's mark to the subcommittee, I had 5 pages of language dealing with the issue of Bosnia and the President's obligation to deal with the Congress on the issue.

On the House floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] worked together to make that language even stronger. We attempted to keep that language in the conference. It was very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, in the last week the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and I have both met with Secretary Perry and Ambassador Holbrooke. We discussed this issue and I asked the Secretary if the President still intended to come to the Congress to get approval before sending troops to Bosnia. His response was, "Yes." And I said, "Well, in what form would that consultation or that approval take?" And Mr. Perry's response was, "I don't know. That's the President's call."

But I agree with the gentleman that American troops should not be sent into hostile situations without the consent of the Congress. If the President is willing to come to Congress and get that approval, that is one thing. But if he is not, then Congress has to do what it can with the purse strings.

Mr. Speaker, I would assure the gentleman that we intend to make sure that that happens.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming what time I have left, there has been a tradition, there has been a tendency of Presidents in both parties to commit American forces and then, once those young men are in harm's way, then come to Congress and ask for the money.

My colleagues know the position that puts us in. Then we are voting against the troops in the field and we know we cannot do that. That is why I think it is so important. That this body speak today and speak now on this issue that this is a congressional decision that we will not run away from. That we want to make this decision before the first American is put in harm's way in the former Yugoslavia.

□ 1545

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, all of us on the subcommittee have the same concern that the gentleman does. As the gentleman knows, I just came back, from Sarajevo. We stayed overnight there, not intentionally, but could not get out because the last

flight was canceled because of the activity—we might define it as activity—going on around Sarajevo.

I have a great concern about putting troops in, and for 3 or 4 years we have been working in the subcommittee trying to convince the administration that, before they make humanitarian deployments, they must come and get authorization from Congress. Now, why do I say humanitarian deployment? I do not think a deployment to Sarajevo or to Bosnia is a national security issue. I believe it is a humanitarian deployment.

On the other hand, I think they are only 20 percent of the way. I do not think that they have come close to settling the problem. What I said in talking to the chief of staff of the White House and talking to Secretary Perry and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], we have agreed that we think they have to have ironclad assurances from all the participants before any Americans are sent in. And Holbrooke is the one that said they are only 20 percent of the way. So they have got 80 percent to go. They are a long way off. I think in conference we can deal with this as we see it developing.

I doubt very much if we will see an agreement before the first of the year. The gentleman from Wisconsin just mentioned to me, will they get them in before the weather gets bad? To me, it is more important that we get an agreement, which is enforceable with robust rules of engagement, with a robust force agreement, with the participants saying, the United States or the NATO allies can enforce this agreement, rather than have them come to an agreement which is a compromise and a danger to American forces.

So we are a long way from agreeing to this. I think in conference, I hope we work something out that would be acceptable and yet agreeable to the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 10 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that my good friend, Mr. OBEY, and I have had many differences on the floor, but we have remained friends throughout those differences.

I was a little offended when I thought the gentleman was trying to compare soldiers in the field to bureaucrats with their hands out. Soldiers in the field are in harm's way. They need the best training they can get. They need the best equipment they can get. They need the best technology they can get to accomplish the mission, No. 1, and to give themselves a little protection, No. 2.

I see nothing wrong with that at all; to the contrary, I support that strongly. I would reaffirm a commitment I have made many, many times. I would never vote to send an American into a

combat situation unless I knew that I had done everything that I possibly could to provide the best training and the best technology and the best equipment possible to accomplish the mission and, yes, give them a little protection at the same time.

So I cannot compare those folks to bureaucrats with their hands out, in the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

There are some bureaucratic requests that were made. We are talking about what was requested by the administration and what was not. Let me tell Members some of the things that were requested by the administration that we did not do. We did not do, for example, the funding for the Russian conversion projects to convert their defense industry to supposedly nondefense industry. But let the record show that they were actually using our money to convert their defense industry to a different type of Russian defense industry.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] talked about the B-2. The Pentagon did not want it. We know the B-2 is an expensive program. It was not in the President's budget. The *Seawolf* is another expensive program, but it was in the President's budget. They are both fairly important.

I remember the battle some years ago about the F-117. The arguments were, well, the Air Force did not request the F-117. The Pentagon did not ask for it. Why should we complete the program? But the Congress decided to complete the program. Congress prevailed. Who knows better than Saddam Hussein how effective the F-117 is because those airplanes flew over Baghdad at night, caused severe damage to Saddam's ability to conduct his war. They were never seen by the enemy because it was a good weapon. The Pentagon did not ask for the funds to complete that program but we did it anyway. Congress decided that it was a good program.

I have looked at the list that the Senator, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has talked about. I saw the list. I added the items up. If we took everything out of this bill that is on the list presented by the Senator, it would only come to about two-thirds of what Mr. OBEY wants to reduce.

What would some of those things be if we took out the list that the Senator sent over? Well, I mentioned the breast cancer program of \$100 million. He thinks that is pork. Ask a woman that has had breast cancer or someone in their family that ever had breast cancer or who has a suspicion of breast cancer, ask them if they think the \$100 million for breast cancer is pork. I think we would find the answer is definitely not.

What about all the soldiers and the sailors and the airmen, the male members of the military? There is money in here for prostate cancer research. That is on the Senator's list. He would take that out. What about head injury re-

search? That is on the Senator's list. He would take that out. What about AIDS research, unfortunately a growing problem in the military? We need to do something about that. The Senator's list would take that out.

What about the Coast Guard, whether we are dealing with drug interdiction, whether we are dealing with search and rescue, whether we are dealing with Cubans and Haitians leaving their homelands to come to the United States? That is all in the interest of the United States. That money is on the Senator's list to take out.

I say to my colleagues that the Senator's list is really mushy. The Senator's list may have a few things in here that would not have to be there, but, for the most part, the list is not a very accurate list as to what is pork and what is not pork.

Our defense program has been reduced for 11 straight years. Defense manpower is down by over 1.2 million personnel. At the same time, the President is sending U.S. troops anywhere he desires without the approval of the Congress.

The Obey amendment would like to deal with procurement funding. Procurement funding, that is the technology and the equipment that I talked about to let the soldiers accomplish their mission and protect themselves at the same time. Procurement funding is 70 percent less in this bill than the procurement level of 10 years ago. This is a pretty good defense bill. I say to the Members on my side of the aisle, it meets the obligation that we made in our Contract With America to change the direction of our national defense, to move away from a hollow force, to be prepared in the event the President decides to send Americans into harm's way. That is what this bill does.

This is a pretty good bill. Mr. Speaker, I ask that Members defeat the Obey motion to instruct and allow us to get to conference and deal with the issues that we have to deal with.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 10 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that sometimes we need to repeat things about 50 times before Members hear what it is that is being said, I am going to repeat an argument I made 10 minutes ago. Before Members get all hot and bothered about the military threat facing the United States, let us compare military spending worldwide.

This chart shows: this piece which represents all of the military spending by all of our potential adversaries put together, including Russia, China, and all of the popgun powers of the world, that compares to the United States military expenditures which are about 2½ times as much. Not included in this chart is the money spent by our European allies on military spending. Does

anybody really think that we are at the edge of Armageddon with this kind of distribution of spending?

When our principal military adversary, Russia, represented by these red bars, has reduced its military spending by 70 percent, while we have reduced ours only by 10 percent, represented by the blue bars, does anybody think there is not any room at all to save a dime or a dollar? I would suggest that is a pretty good margin for error.

Now, the gentleman refers to some items listed on Senator McCain's list and says we should not cut them. Don't! Keep them! But I do ask why should we be funding wastewater treatment plants in Hawaii? Why should we in my own State be providing money for a cleanup of a site which the pentagon itself says there is no Pentagon liability for? Why should we be doing that? We did not do it in the House bill. Why is that being done?

Why are we providing for the expenditure of \$20 million worth of improvements to a federally owned educational facility prior to transferring that facility to local educational agencies? I know nothing about that project. But I can tell Members one thing. I would sure like to get that deal in my district, have the feds spend \$20 million on a project and then turn it over to my local school people. Not a bad deal, baby, if you can get it. Not bad at all.

Or, for instance, the committee prohibits the downsizing or the disestablishing of the 53d Weather Reconnaissance Squadron. I do not know if that is a good idea or not, but it costs additional money. It prohibits the use of Edwards Air Force Base as the interim air head for the national training center, in another pork fight between members. I do not know which side is right, but the decision the committee made costs the most money.

I suppose I would not be here today doing this if it were not for the vote that the majority is going to ram down our throats tomorrow on Medicare. Tomorrow we are going to be standing here, and the majority party is going to be demanding that we cut \$270 billion out of Medicare to provide a \$245 billion tax cut, most of which will go to people who make over \$100 thousand smackeroos a year. I think that is unfair. I think that is immoral.

Yet, we are being told that we ought to further the squeeze on the appropriations side of the budget, on domestic programs. In fact we had to make \$7 billion in additional reductions in education, in job training, in environmental protection, in agriculture, in natural resources protection in order to free up this \$7 billion for the Pentagon. Then what is it spent on? Is it spent on readiness? No.

As I said earlier, this bill, when we compare real dollars to real dollars and get the categorizations right, this bill spends half a billion dollars less on readiness than President Clinton's own budget.

All of my colleagues know that the B-2 would not stand a chance of a

snowball in we know where of surviving a vote on this floor if the contractor had not spread those contracts out to so many subcontractors that we have over 40 States who are going to get a little bennie from that B-2 project.

□ 1600

In addition, Mr. Speaker, when we take a look at what that baby costs, 1 billion 200 million bucks a crack, and then we remind ourselves that the Pentagon did not even ask for it, that this committee is choosing to buy twice as many of those planes as the Pentagon wants! I would suggest to my colleagues, given this picture, and given this picture, there is a little room for cutting.

So I repeat. All this motion to instruct says, without singling out any single item, all it says is let us take three-quarters of the pork which was listed by Senator McCain in his letter. Let us assume he is wrong on 25 percent of it and cut out the rest. The committee can choose which items get cut. That is all this motion says.

Mr. Speaker, I want to see how many people on this floor are going to vote today to preserve \$3 billion in pork in the military budget and then tomorrow are going to vote to stick it to the old folks. I want to see how many of my colleagues really have that much guts.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 134, nays 290, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 721]

YEAS—134

Ackerman	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Andrews	Dellums	Hinchey
Barcia	Deutsch	Jackson-Lee
Barrett (WI)	Dingell	Jacobs
Becerra	Doggett	Jefferson
Beilenson	Duncan	Johnson (SD)
Bentsen	Durbin	Johnston
Berman	Ehlers	Kaptur
Blute	Engel	Kennedy (MA)
Bonior	Eshoo	Kildee
Brown (CA)	Evans	Klecza
Brown (OH)	Farr	Klug
Bryant (TX)	Fattah	LaFalce
Cardin	Filner	Lantos
Clay	Foglietta	Levin
Clayton	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Clement	Fox	Lincoln
Collins (IL)	Frank (MA)	Lipinski
Collins (MI)	Furse	LoBiondo
Conyers	Ganske	Lofgren
Costello	Gephardt	Lowe
Coyne	Gordon	Luther
Danner	Green	Maloney

Markey	Payne (NJ)	Shays
Martini	Payne (VA)	Skaggs
McCarthy	Pelosi	Slaughter
McDermott	Petri	Stark
McKinney	Pomeroy	Stokes
Meehan	Poshard	Studds
Menendez	Ramstad	Stupak
Mfume	Rangel	Thurman
Miller (CA)	Reed	Towns
Minge	Riggs	Velazquez
Moakley	Rivers	Vento
Morella	Roemer	Ward
Nadler	Roth	Waters
Neal	Roukema	Watt (NC)
Neumann	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Oberstar	Rush	Williams
Obey	Sanders	Woolsey
Olver	Sawyer	Wyden
Orton	Schroeder	Wynn
Owens	Schumer	Yates
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Zimmer
Pastor	Serrano	

NAYS—290

Abercrombie	Dornan	Kennedy (RI)
Allard	Doyle	Kennelly
Archer	Dreier	Kim
Army	Dunn	King
Bachus	Edwards	Kingston
Baesler	Ehrlich	Klink
Baker	Emerson	Knollenberg
Baker (LA)	English	Kolbe
Baldacci	Ensign	LaHood
Ballenger	Everett	Largent
Barr	Ewing	Latham
Barrett (NE)	Fawell	LaTourrette
Bartlett	Fazio	Laughlin
Barton	Fields (TX)	Lazio
Bass	Flanagan	Leach
Bateman	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Bereuter	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Bevill	Fowler	Lightfoot
Bilbray	Franks (CT)	Linder
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Livingston
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	Longley
Bliley	Frisa	Lucas
Boehlert	Frost	Manton
Boehner	Funderburk	Manzullo
Bonilla	Gallegly	Martinez
Bono	Gejdenson	Mascara
Borski	Gekas	Matsui
Boucher	Geren	McCollum
Brewster	Gibbons	McCreery
Browder	Gilchrist	McDade
Brown (FL)	Gillmor	McHale
Brownback	Gilman	McHugh
Bryant (TN)	Gonzalez	McInnis
Bunn	Goodlatte	McIntosh
Bunning	Goodling	McKeon
Burr	Goss	McNulty
Burton	Graham	Meek
Buyer	Greenwood	Metcalfe
Callahan	Gunderson	Meyers
Calvert	Gutknecht	Mica
Camp	Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)
Canady	Hall (TX)	Mink
Castle	Hamilton	Molinari
Chabot	Hancock	Mollohan
Chambliss	Hansen	Montgomery
Chenoweth	Harman	Moorhead
Christensen	Hastert	Moran
Chrysler	Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Clinger	Hastings (WA)	Myers
Clyburn	Hayes	Myrick
Coble	Hayworth	Nethercutt
Coburn	Hefley	Ney
Coleman	Hefner	Norwood
Collins (GA)	Heineman	Nussle
Combest	Herger	Ortiz
Condit	Hilleary	Oxley
Cooley	Hobson	Packard
Cox	Hoekstra	Parker
Cramer	Hoke	Paxon
Crane	Holden	Peterson (FL)
Crapo	Horn	Peterson (MN)
Creameans	Hostettler	Pickett
Cubin	Hoyer	Pombo
Cunningham	Hunter	Porter
Davis	Hutchinson	Portman
de la Garza	Hyde	Pryce
Deal	Inglis	Quillen
DeLauro	Istook	Quinn
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Dicks	Jones	Richardson
Dixon	Kanjorski	Roberts
Dooley	Kasich	Rogers
Doolittle	Kelly	Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	Traficant	Bass	Fattah	Latham	Regula	Skaggs	Traficant
Rose	Souder	Upton	Bateman	Fawell	LaTourette	Richardson	Skeen	Upton
Royce	Spence	Visclosky	Becerra	Fazio	Laughlin	Riggs	Skelton	Velazquez
Sabo	Spratt	Vucanovich	Beilenson	Fields (TX)	Lazio	Rivers	Slaughter	Vento
Salmon	Stearns	Waldholtz	Bilbray	Filner	Leach	Roberts	Smith (MI)	Visclosky
Sanford	Stenholm	Walker	Bilirakis	Flanagan	Levin	Roemer	Smith (NJ)	Vucanovich
Saxton	Stockman	Walsh	Bishop	Foglietta	Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Smith (TX)	Waldholtz
Scarborough	Stump	Wamp	Biley	Foley	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)	Walker
Schaefer	Talent	Watts (OK)	Brown (CA)	Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	Walsh
Schiff	Tanner	Weldon (FL)	Brown (FL)	Ford	Lightfoot	Rose	Souder	Wamp
Scott	Tate	Weldon (PA)	Brown (OH)	Fowler	Lincoln	Roth	Spence	Ward
Seastrand	Tauzin	Weller	Brown (TN)	Fox	Linder	Roukema	Spratt	Waters
Shadegg	Taylor (MS)	White	Bryant (TX)	Frank (MA)	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Stearns	Watt (NC)
Shaw	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield	Bunn	Franks (CT)	Livingston	Rush	Stenholm	Watts (OK)
Shuster	Thomas	Wicker	Bunning	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Sabo	Stockman	Waxman
Sisisky	Thompson	Wilson	Burr	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Salmon	Stokes	Weldon (FL)
Skeen	Thornberry	Wise	Burton	Frisa	Longley	Sanders	Studds	Weldon (PA)
Skelton	Thornton	Wolf	Buyer	Frost	Lowey	Sanford	Stump	Weller
Smith (MI)	Tiahrt	Young (AK)	Callahan	Funderburk	Lucas	Sawyer	Stupak	White
Smith (NJ)	Torkildsen	Young (FL)	Calvert	Furse	Luther	Saxton	Talent	Whitfield
Smith (TX)	Torres	Zeliff	Camp	Gallegly	Maloney	Scarborough	Tanner	Wicker
Smith (WA)	Torricelli		Canady	Ganske	Manton	Schaefer	Tate	Williams

NOT VOTING—8

Chapman	Hilliard	Tucker
Fields (LA)	Houghton	Volkmer
Flake	Tejeda	

□ 1622

Mr. QUINN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SHAYS, MOAKLEY, and GANSKE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, MCDADE, LIVINGSTON, LEWIS of California, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, MURTHA, DICKS, WILSON, HEFNER, SABO, and OBEY.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION IS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves, pursuant to rule XXVIII (28), clause 6(a) of the House Rules, that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on the bill, H.R. 2126, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration; provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have a right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXVIII, this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 3, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 722]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Bachus	Barcia
Ackerman	Baesler	Barr
Allard	Baker (CA)	Barrett (NE)
Andrews	Baker (LA)	Barrett (WI)
Archer	Baldacci	Bartlett
Army	Ballenger	Barton

Bass	Bateman	Becerra	Beilenson	Bilbray	Bilirakis	Bishop	Biley	Blute	Boehlert	Boehner	Bonilla	Bonior	Bono	Borski	Boucher	Brewster	Brown (CA)	Brown (FL)	Brown (OH)	Brownback	Bryant (TN)	Bryant (TX)	Bunn	Bunning	Burr	Burton	Buyer	Callahan	Calvert	Camp	Canady	Cardin	Castle	Chabot	Chambliss	Christensen	Chryslers	Clay	Clayton	Clement	Clinger	Clyburn	Coble	Coburn	Coleman	Collins (GA)	Collins (IL)	Collins (MI)	Combest	Condit	Conyers	Cooley	Costello	Cox	Coyne	Cramer	Crane	Crapo	Creameans	Cubin	Cunningham	Danner	Davis	de la Garza	Deal	DeLauro	DeLay	Dellums	Deutsch	Diaz-Balart	Dickey	Dicks	Dingell	Dixon	Doggett	Doolittle	Dornan	Doyle	Dreier	Duncan	Dunn	Durbin	Edwards	Ehlers	Ehrlich	Emerson	Engel	English	Ensign	Esholm	Evans	Everett	Ewing	Farr
------	---------	---------	-----------	---------	-----------	--------	-------	-------	----------	---------	---------	--------	------	--------	---------	----------	------------	------------	------------	-----------	-------------	-------------	------	---------	------	--------	-------	----------	---------	------	--------	--------	--------	--------	-----------	-------------	-----------	------	---------	---------	---------	---------	-------	--------	---------	--------------	--------------	--------------	---------	--------	---------	--------	----------	-----	-------	--------	-------	-------	-----------	-------	------------	--------	-------	-------------	------	---------	-------	---------	---------	-------------	--------	-------	---------	-------	---------	-----------	--------	-------	--------	--------	------	--------	---------	--------	---------	---------	-------	---------	--------	--------	-------	---------	-------	------

Fattah	Fawell	Fazio	Fields (TX)	Filner	Flanagan	Foglietta	Foley	Forbes	Ford	Fowler	Fox	Frank (MA)	Franks (CT)	Franks (NJ)	Frelinghuysen	Frigren	Longley	Lowey	Lucas	Luther	Maloney	Mannton	Manzullo	Markey	Martinez	Martini	Mascara	Matsui	McCarthy	McCollum	McCrery	McDade	Gordon	McDermott	Goss	Graham	Green	Greenwood	Gunderson	Gutierrez	Gutknecht	Hall (OH)	Hall (TX)	Hamilton	Hancock	Hansen	Harman	Hastert	Hastings (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Hayes	Hayworth	Hefley	Hefner	Heineman	Herger	Hilleary	Hinchee	Hobson	Hoekstra	Hoke	Holden	Horn	Hostettler	Houghton	Hoyer	Hunter	Hutchinson	Hyde	Inglis	Istook	Jackson-Lee	Jacobs	Jefferson	Johnson (CT)	Johnson (SD)	Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, Sam	Johnston	Jones	Kanjorski	Kaptur	Kasich	Kasich	Kelly	Kennedy (MA)	Kennedy (RI)	Kennelly	Kildee	Kim	King	Kingston	Klecza	Klink	Klug	Knollenberg	Kolbe	LaFalce	LaHood	Lantos	Largent
--------	--------	-------	-------------	--------	----------	-----------	-------	--------	------	--------	-----	------------	-------------	-------------	---------------	---------	---------	-------	-------	--------	---------	---------	----------	--------	----------	---------	---------	--------	----------	----------	---------	--------	--------	-----------	------	--------	-------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------	---------	--------	--------	---------	---------------	---------------	-------	----------	--------	--------	----------	--------	----------	---------	--------	----------	------	--------	------	------------	----------	-------	--------	------------	------	--------	--------	-------------	--------	-----------	--------------	--------------	----------------	--------------	----------	-------	-----------	--------	--------	--------	-------	--------------	--------------	----------	--------	-----	------	----------	--------	-------	------	-------------	-------	---------	--------	--------	---------

NAYS—3

Chenoweth	DeFazio	Stark
-----------	---------	-------

NOT VOTING—11

Browder	Flake	Tejeda
Chapman	Gephardt	Tucker
Dooley	Hilliard	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Rangel	

□ 1642

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the following Members be the conferees on the part of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4) "An Act to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence": Mr. ROTH, Mr. DOLE, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. PRYOR, and Mr. BREAUX. From the Committee on Labor and Human Resources for the consideration of title VI and any additional items within their jurisdiction including the Child Abuse and Protection Act title; Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. COATS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, and Ms. MIKULSKI. From the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DOLE, Mr. HELMS, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. PRYOR.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) "Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 402".

DISAPPROVAL OF CERTAIN SENTENCING GUIDELINE AMENDMENTS

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 237 and ask for its immediate consideration.