

things like how not to use drugs. It is so important to our youth today. But if we are going to ask these young men and women to come out of the areas where they are and to serve their countrymen, then we have to provide the very best for them.

I will never forget, when we went into Desert Storm and we faced one of the largest armies in the entire world, and yet we came out of there with so few casualties. Why? Because those young men and women were the best trained, the best equipped young men and women that have ever served in this military. They had state-of-the-art equipment. For instance, they had equipment that allowed them to see the enemy when the enemy could not see them. That saved lives.

That is what this is all about today. When we look at this bill before us, it provides for procurement, it provides for state-of-the-art weaponry and machinery and equipment that these young men and women need. That is why this bill is so terribly important. Come over here, vote for this rule, and then vote for the bill. It is the best thing Members can do today.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 29, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 864]

YEAS—378

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Clement
Allard	Bono	Clinger
Andrews	Borski	Clyburn
Archer	Boucher	Coble
Armey	Brewster	Coburn
Bachus	Browder	Coleman
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Collins (GA)
Baker (CA)	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Baker (LA)	Brownback	Combest
Baldacci	Bryant (TN)	Condit
Ballenger	Bryant (TX)	Cooley
Barcia	Bunn	Costello
Barr	Bunning	Coyne
Barrett (NE)	Burr	Cramer
Bartlett	Burton	Crane
Barton	Buyer	Crapo
Bass	Callahan	Creameans
Bateman	Calvert	Cubin
Bellenson	Camp	Cunningham
Bentsen	Campbell	Danner
Bereuter	Canady	Davis
Berman	Cardin	de la Garza
Bevill	Castle	Deal
Bilbray	Chabot	DeLauro
Bilirakis	Chambliss	DeLay
Bishop	Chapman	Dellums
Bliley	Chenoweth	Diaz-Balart
Blute	Christensen	Dickey
Boehlert	Chrysler	Dicks
Boehner	Clay	Dingell

Dixon	Johnson, E. B.
Doggett	Johnson, Sam
Dooley	Johnston
Doolittle	Jones
Dornan	Kanjorski
Doyle	Kaptur
Dreier	Kasich
Duncan	Kelly
Dunn	Kennedy (MA)
Edwards	Kennedy (RI)
Ehlers	Kennelly
Ehrlich	Kildee
Emerson	Kim
Engel	King
English	Kingston
Ensign	Klecza
Eshoo	Klink
Evans	Klug
Everett	Knollenberg
Ewing	Kolbe
Farr	LaFalce
Fattah	LaHood
Fawell	Lantos
Fazio	Largent
Fields (LA)	Latham
Fields (TX)	LaTourette
Filner	Laughlin
Flake	Lazio
Flanagan	Leach
Foglietta	Levin
Foley	Lewis (GA)
Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Ford	Lincoln
Fowler	Linder
Fox	Lipinski
Franks (CT)	Livingston
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo
Frelinghuysen	Longley
Frist	Lowe
Funderburk	Lucas
Furse	Manton
Galleghy	Manzullo
Ganske	Martinez
Gejdenson	Martini
Gekas	Mascara
Gephardt	Matsui
Geren	McCarthy
Gibbons	McCollum
Gilchrest	McCrery
Gillmor	McDade
Gilman	McHale
Gonzalez	McHugh
Goodlatte	McIntosh
Goodling	McKeon
Gordon	McKinney
Goss	McNulty
Green	Meehan
Greenwood	Meek
Gutknecht	Menendez
Hall (OH)	Metcalf
Hall (TX)	Meyers
Hamilton	Mica
Hancock	Miller (FL)
Hansen	Minge
Harman	Mink
Hastert	Moakley
Hastings (FL)	Molinari
Hastings (WA)	Mollohan
Hayworth	Montgomery
Hefley	Moorhead
Hefner	Morella
Heineman	Murtha
Herger	Myers
Hilleary	Myrick
Hilliard	Nethercutt
Hinchee	Neumann
Hobson	Ney
Hoekstra	Norwood
Hoke	Nussle
Holden	Oberstar
Horn	Obey
Hostettler	Ortiz
Houghton	Orton
Hoyer	Oxley
Hunter	Packard
Hutchinson	Pallone
Hyde	Parker
Inglis	Pastor
Istook	Paxon
Jackson (IL)	Payne (VA)
Jackson-Lee	Peterson (FL)
(TX)	Peterson (MN)
Jacobs	Petri
Jefferson	Pickett
Johnson (CT)	Pombo
Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy

Portman	Rohrabacher
Poshard	Ros-Lehtinen
Radanovich	Rose
Rahall	Roth
Ramstad	Roukema
Reed	Royce
Regula	Sabo
Richardson	Salmon
Riggs	Sanders
Rivers	Sanford
Roberts	Sawyer
Roemer	Saxton
Rogers	Scarborough
Kim	Schaefer
King	Schiff
Kingston	Scott
Klecza	Seastrand
Klink	Sensenbrenner
Klug	Shadegg
Knollenberg	Shaw
Kolbe	Shays
LaFalce	Shuster
LaHood	Lipinski
Lantos	Livingston
Largent	LoBiondo
Latham	Longley
LaTourette	Lowe
Laughlin	Lucas
Lazio	Manton
Leach	Manzullo
Levin	Martinez
Lewis (GA)	Martini
Lewis (KY)	Mascara
Lincoln	Matsui
Linder	McCarthy
Lipinski	McCollum
Livingston	McCrery
LoBiondo	McDade
Longley	McHale
Lowe	McHugh
Lucas	McIntosh
Manton	McKeon
Manzullo	McKinney
Martinez	McNulty
Martini	Meehan
Mascara	Meek
Matsui	Menendez
McCarthy	Metcalf
McCollum	Meyers
McCrery	Mica
McDade	Miller (FL)
McHale	Minge
McHugh	Mink
McIntosh	Moakley
McKeon	Molinari
McKinney	Mollohan
McNulty	Montgomery
Meehan	Moorhead
Meek	Morella
Menendez	Murtha
Metcalf	Myers
Meyers	Myrick
Mica	Nethercutt
Miller (FL)	Neumann
Minge	Ney
Mink	Norwood
Moakley	Nussle
Molinari	Oberstar
Mollohan	Obey
Montgomery	Ortiz
Moorhead	Orton
Morella	Oxley
Murtha	Packard
Myers	Pallone
Myrick	Parker
Nethercutt	Pastor
Neumann	Paxon
Ney	Payne (VA)
Norwood	Peterson (FL)
Nussle	Peterson (MN)
Oberstar	Petri
Obey	Pickett
Ortiz	Pombo
Orton	Pomeroy
Oxley	Porter
Packard	
Pallone	
Parker	
Pastor	
Paxon	
Payne (VA)	
Peterson (FL)	
Peterson (MN)	
Petri	
Pickett	
Pombo	
Pomeroy	
Porter	

NAYS—29

Barrett (WI)	Maloney	Rangel
Becerra	Markey	Royal-Allard
Brown (OH)	McDermott	Rush
Conyers	Mfume	Schroeder
DeFazio	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Durbin	Neal	Stark
Frank (MA)	Olver	Watt (NC)
Guderson	Owens	Wyden
Lofgren	Payne (NJ)	Yates
Luther	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—26

Ackerman	Lewis (CA)	Stokes
Bonior	Lightfoot	Torricelli
Clayton	McInnis	Towns
Collins (IL)	Moran	Velazquez
Cox	Nadler	Vislosky
Deutsch	Pryce	Waters
Graham	Quillen	Waxman
Gutierrez	Quinn	Young (FL)
Hayes	Schumer	

□ 1249

Messrs. RUSH, OLVER, and LUTHER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. CHAPMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 863 and "no" on rollcall 864.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 307, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1530), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 307, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 13, 1995, at page H14378.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I bring this conference report on the fiscal year 1996 defense authorization bill before the House with a great sense of satisfaction. At the beginning of this year, the Committee on National Security set out to craft a defense bill that would achieve four fundamental goals. Through the course of committee, House and conference action, we never lost sight of these objectives.

First, we promised to improve the quality of life for our military personnel and their families. A number of critically important provisions in this bill, such as a 2.4-percent pay raise, enhanced housing allowances and medical benefits, COLA equity for military retirees and increased funding for family housing and barracks, are a testament to our trying to keep our eye on the ball and looking out for the people who serve in our Armed Forces.

Lately we have heard much discussion about the importance of supporting our troops. I can think of no better way to put our money where our mouths are, when it comes to a tangible expression of support, than passing this bill. Nor can I think of a better Christmas present than beginning to reduce the growth in out-of-pocket expenses being incurred by military personnel and their families by passing this bill.

Second, we promised to sustain short- and long-term readiness. This bill increases funding for critical readiness accounts more than \$1.6 billion over the President's request, while putting a halt to the debilitating practice of diverting needed training and operating funds to pay for unbudgeted humanitarian and peacekeeping operations.

Third, we set out to begin addressing the growing modernization shortfalls that have resulted from a decade-long 70 percent real decline in procurement spending. This bill puts an end to the procurement holiday and helps to shore up a dramatically downsized industrial base by adding funds to a number of underfunded and unfunded programs.

Our military leaders have just recently requested that we not wait for modernization as suggested by the administration.

Fourth, we set out to initiate a number of important and long overdue structural and process reforms in the Pentagon. This bill contains the most forward-leaning package of acquisition reforms in decades, as well as reductions in an oversized Pentagon staff and acquisition work force. The bill also begins the process of privatizing a number of the Pentagon's support functions in pursuit of a greater cost effectiveness and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that promises were made and promises are being kept.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the product of the tireless effort on the part of all committee members. In particular, however, it is the product of the committees, subcommittee and panel chairmen, along with their distinguished ranking members who support this conference report.

It is these Members in particular who deserve the lion's share of the credit for all that is positive in this bill. However, I do personally want to recognize Chairman HUNTER, Chairman WELDON, Chairman BATEMAN, Chairman HEFLEY, Chairman DORNAN, and Chairman MCHUGH for their dedication, commit-

ment, and perseverance. Their expertise and competence have made my job, all of our jobs, much easier.

And also the ranking members of those subcommittees. In the end, this was a bipartisan bill. Out of committee, with only three dissenting votes. Off the House floor, out of the conference, and I hope will be on final passage this afternoon.

I would also be remiss if I failed to thank my friend and colleague, Mr. CLINGER, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for his herculean efforts all year long on the issue of acquisition reform. More than any other single Member on either side of the aisle, BILL CLINGER is responsible for the comprehensive reforms to our Government's obsolete and inefficient procurement system contained in this bill.

I also want to stop right here and thank the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for his efforts.

Finally, I want to express my thanks to the entire staff of the Committee on National Security. Despite a 20-percent cutback in the committee staff following last year's election, we are nearing the end of one of the busiest years I can remember, having served here for 25 years. The Committee on National Security staff is hardworking, dedicated, and professional. Their commitment to public service, which is all too often underappreciated and overlooked, is exemplary.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. I do so for reasons that are both procedural as well as substantive. I will not take up the time of the body on the procedural issues, though I think they are awesome. This will be the product of a discussion between the minority and majority Members confined to the dynamics of the committee, and I will not raise these issues on the floor. Rather, I would now turn to the substantive reasons of disagreement with the content of the conference report.

First, Mr. Speaker, I believe this conference report represents a return to the cold-war-era defense budget. In particular, weapons programs that are inappropriate in this post-cold-war era are funded. In so doing, the authorization measure fails to make the additional legitimate savings afforded by the significant geopolitical changes we have experienced to date.

□ 1300

Moreover, it fails to fund sufficiently operations and maintenance accounts that must in turn fund the real requirements of the new era, peacekeeping and humanitarian operations, while also maintaining the training programs required to keep our military ready for its traditional missions.

Let me now respond to specific concerns.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the ballistic missile defense program, the bill would require the deployment of a national missile defense system by the year 2003. It envisions a multisite system of more than 100 interceptors provisioned for early upgrade to a space-based weapons component. Such a system would constitute unilateral abrogation of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, referred to as the ABM treaty. This unnecessary abrogation of the ABM treaty would give the Russian Government reason to withdraw their support for START II, as they have said they would, if we go forward with unilateral abrogation. This would likely ruin our best chances for retaining strategic stability at reduced, manageable, and less-expensive levels.

Antisatellite program, the ASAT, the bill includes \$30 million to resurrect the previously terminated ASAT program. This puts the United States in the position of explicitly militarizing space. Now we had terminated this program. Why, for any rhyme or reason, would we want to resurrect this monstrosity of the cold war is a mystery to this gentleman.

With respect to the B-2 bomber, the bill provides for \$493 million over the President's request for this program. Worse, the bill repeals, Mr. Speaker, the cost and quantity caps in current law for the existing program. This would clear the way for 20 additional B-2 bombers which the Air Force neither wants nor needs.

With respect to the Cooperative Threat Reduction [CTR] Program, the bill restrains CTR in ways that may impede the most effective program of dismantling the Russian nuclear weapons complex and infrastructure.

With respect to submarines, the bill envisions—listen to this, Mr. Speaker—a noncompetitive construction of four one-of-a-kind prototype submarines before determining what the successor to the current *Seawolf* should be. It would also buy a third *Seawolf* to tide over the industrial base in the interim, and in this gentleman's opinion this is a costly and ineffective way to determine future submarine requirements.

With respect to budget policy, overall the bill adds some \$5.2 billion above the administration request for procurement and resorted to what we call split or incremental funding to finance a third *Seawolf* and the DDG-51 destroyer program. Many of the additional spending requirements will bring with them funding tails that would require increased budgets or cuts of other programs to sustain in the future. Adds in the ballistic missile defense, the B-2, and the shipbuilding programs are among the most significant future budget drivers.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any program, and I do not like to use the term pork, and I rarely, if we go back in the RECORD, rarely have used that term, but if there is a piece of legislation

that took care of people as opposed to addressing the reality-oriented national security needs of this country, this bill does it. We bring forward several ships all the way into the year 2000 back to 1996 to be funded now. This is not a way to handle the fiduciary responsibilities of the American taxpayer.

With respect to HIV, Mr. Speaker, the bill would require the discharge of members of the Armed Forces who have the HIV-1 virus. This is unnecessary and discriminatory. The military has stated that this is not a problem as they are able to discharge personnel when necessary under current law. It would preclude the military from utilizing military personnel who are completely functional in their jobs and in whom the military has invested significant training resources.

With respect to abortion, the bill would amend permanent law to include the restrictions on the use of Department of Defense facilities for abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger. This conservative agenda issue was incorporated in the bill without one single hearing.

On the subject with respect to the environment, in a departure from advances made over the past 2 years environmental programs are underfunded.

With respect to command and control, this provision governing the operation of U.S. troops during peacekeeping operations impinges upon the role of the President as Commander in Chief in a manner that may very well be unconstitutional.

With respect to contingency operations, while the bill provides for funding of unbudgeted contingency operations, it contains a provision that would require the President to submit a supplemental appropriation which may be an unconstitutional direction to the President. We have often done this in report language. This now is in bill form, a very different approach.

With respect to nuclear weapons, the bill would authorize the needless expenditure of resources to maintain and expand the Department of Energy nuclear weapons infrastructure in advance of the programmatic environmental impact statement that is being produced on infrastructure requirements.

On nuclear testing, the bill needlessly prepares for future nuclear weapon testing.

The technology reinvestment program, the bill terminates this successful program, only provides \$195 million to complete pending projects.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the above reasons it should come as no surprise that the President has indicated, and I have a copy of the letter for my colleagues' perusal, statement of administration policy from OMB, that the President has indicated that he will veto this bill in its present form.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report and allow

members of the conference to readdress these issues, bringing forth a bill that can be supported by both Congress and the administration.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], who is going to be retiring this year. I know of no one in this body, and I have been here 25 years, who has been more supportive of the military than SONNY MONTGOMERY. He is known throughout the world as the supporter of the military, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to let him have 2 minutes at this time.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the chairman for those very, very kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

The bill is a very good bill, and especially to the National Guard and Reserve. In fact, General Baca, who is head of the National Guard, says his advisers tell him that this is the best bill in 10 years for the Air National Guard and for the Army National Guard.

We have included in this bill an addition of \$770 million for new equipment for the reserves of the different services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a point I would like to make here very strongly: When we give money to the National Guard and Reserve, we have every State in the Union and a lot of small communities will get these funds. It will not go to the big bases, but it will go to all of the communities around the country.

The technicians for the Guard and Reserve were raised by 1,400 persons. We also were able to extend—this is very important also—we were able to extend the current 15 days of military leave for technicians by an additional 44 days to reflect the increased reliance upon these personnel. In the Bosnia operation, Air Guardsmen and Air Reservists lose part of their pay unless this law is changed.

The Youth Challenge Program to help our young men and women around the country is extended for another 18 months.

The National Guard can still do community service if it is tied to the training of our different units in the country.

Let me say instead of cutting each fighter squadron to 12 in the Air National Guard and Air Reserve the bill provides for 15 aircraft in each squadron instead of 12 to 15.

The bill includes the program we offered to buy down interest rates for service personnel at military bases. This is a good test program to let the young soldiers buy homes under the veterans' programs, and I certainly rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill when it passed the House. I thought then that the parts of it I found problematic might be scrubbed out in conference, but it still comes from conference with some problems and, I think, still can be resolved. So, in the hope that it might be put through the scrubber one more time I will vote against the conference report today.

Mr. problem, by and large, with the bill is the same problem I have with the appropriation bill. Though I voted for it, I think it is the worst problem in the bill because I do not think that either bill is realistic about the future. I think we have a mismatch between defense plans and defense budget, and I think this conference report adds to the problem.

My colleagues see between fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 2002 the Republican budget calls for a national defense spending budget authority to increase from \$265 billion in 1996 to \$280 billion, going up about \$15 billion or in increments of about \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year. That is going to be a hard line to toe in a budget that takes discretionary spending from \$548 billion down to \$513 billion in 2002.

During this same 7-year period, the Clinton budget allocates \$20 billion less to defense. This too will be a tough path to follow; it will call for a lot of tradeoffs; but in the last 2 years, the Clinton budget is more realistic than the Republican budget about funding for national defense. In 2001 and 2002, the Clinton budget actually allocates \$15 billion more to defense than the Republican budget.

What happens in this Republican budget is a truncation in those out-years to squeeze it into their plan to balance the budget by the year 2002. The Clinton budget, on the other hand, realistically recognizes that in those out-years systems like the F-22 are going to be coming to fruition, and it rises to accommodate the cost of these systems. Despite their austerity, this truncation in the out-years, this Republican budget in the short term, this bill, is loaded down with more systems, four prototype submarines, two DDG destroyers, up to 20 B-2 bombers, new systems like space-based lasers, ASAT. The Navy's Upper-Tier system has risen from being just a testing prototype system to being a full up core TMD system. Mandated IOC's, a practice we have rarely done, but here we have mandated an initial operational capability date for missile defense system, for theater missile defense system, for Lower-Tier, Upper-Tier, for PAC-3, and we speeded up the milestones for Brilliant eyes.

This is not a budget that looks toward an austerity period coming ahead of us. It only raises the risk of a train

wreck down the path, and I do not think it can be accomplished in the long run on the spending track that is laid down in the overall Republican budget.

Let me just speak a minute to BMD, ballistic missile defense, because I happen to know something about that.

□ 1315

This budget contains a \$450 million plus-up for national missile defense. The mandated IODC or deployment date is 2003. I am basically supportive of that. If we deployed just at Grand Forks this is realistic, but it will still add \$3 billion to the budget that we are working on because of the deployment date. However, if we deployed at several sites, which this report anticipates, then the cost goes up and it goes up astronomically, about \$5 billion a site. Though it is in this budget, it is nowhere provided for in the overall budget.

Mr. Speaker, buried in this conference report also is a \$50 million plus-up for space-based chemical lasers. That is not terribly objectionable by itself, but tagged onto it is a mandate for an on-orbit test of a demonstration system by the end of 1999. That is not far away. This seemingly innocuous direction, added to the report without any discussion in conference to my knowledge, carriers with it a price tag that would easily run to \$1 billion. That is low-balling the estimate. That is why I say this conference report needs another scrub in order to make it realistic within the budget we pretend to be operating upon.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] who is the chairman of our Committee on Appropriations and one of the strongest supporters we have of rebuilding our military.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1530, the 1996 Defense authorization bill. I believe without it, frankly, the 2.4 percent pay increase for the folks in Bosnia and all the military is in great jeopardy. Without this bill, there would be no COLA and other adjustments to offset the inequities between civilians and military.

There are going to be those that might come here today and propose "Well, we could always do a continuing resolution that would take care of those issues." I, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, could not support that, because I think to do that in that manner contradicts the authorization process. We always hear that the appropriators are intruding into the authorizers or the authorizers are intruding into the appropriations process. The fact is we have no different types of process. The way to handle major policy issues generally is by virtue of the authorization process. This bill should pass, because

we need to establish the policy of defense in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, a continuing resolution would neglect the critical procurement and Pentagon reforms that are needed, that must be updated, and would thus be neglected in a continuing resolution. A continuing resolution would omit authorization for new starts in military construction and military housing. Some \$458 million in increases might not be properly appropriated for construction of 68 barracks. Quality of life projects serving some 9,200 military families in one fashion or another will not occur without this authorization. Without this bill, we might retard the deployment of an effective missile defense system.

Others have said that is a good deal, that we do not need a missile defense system. We know how fast technology has changed in this world over the last 10 years. All you have to do is sit in front of your little personal computer and do things that rooms full of computers could not do just 10 or 15 years ago. There are a lot of people, with the best of intentions in the world, that can sit in front of those computers and send missiles 2,200 or 3,200 miles across the globe and they can put attachments on those missiles which can deliver nuclear, chemical, and biological warheads.

This country today does not have the ability to defend against one of those missiles, and certainly not an intercontinental ballistic missile, so I believe it is imperative that this bill pass so we can address, properly and intelligently, the need to deploy a system that can protect our people, the people of this Nation, of this continent, and all around the world, people in our Armed Forces in every corner of the globe, against incoming missiles.

I believe it is important to pass this bill so no longer will we be seeing attempts by the administration to tie our hands and keep our Armed Forces from doing what they should be doing, and that is deploying defenses against such incoming missiles.

Without the bill we would omit vital revisions in command and control rules for our military forces involved in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

We would not be addressing the need identified by every commander in the field to increase readiness and training funding.

And, without this bill, we would not have the modernization program increases in shipbuilding, tanks, and aircraft modernization programs that have been cut 70 percent since 1985.

Proponents of a selective CR would fail to address the real need for defense policy changes.

That may be what they want, \* \* \* but that is not good for our arms forces or our country—at a time when our troops need our closest attention!!

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this defense authorization conference report.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague,

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, as others have pointed out, this bill is stacked with weapons that the Pentagon does not need or want, and the cost of these unwanted weapons will threaten more pressing priorities, such as decent pay, sufficient O&M funding, and a capable civilian work force.

This bill will also undermine our leadership on anti-personnel land mines. The Senate overwhelmingly approved an amendment to enact a 1-year moratorium on the United States of AP land mines, but in this conference the House would sabotage that with an amendment that would require DOD certification before the amendment went into effect. This would hurt our leadership in the next session of the review conference of the 1980 land mines protocol. Our previous leadership was based on a congressionally approved export moratorium which was helpful in bringing nations to the table. The language in this conference will take that progress back.

In addition, without a hearing at all, the Republican leadership stripped language that would have given more flexibility to DOD in administering the demining grants and providing demining equipment to other countries. This only means more innocent women, men, and children will be killed or injured by land mines.

Former U.S. Marine Corps Commandant Al Gray has stated, "We kill more Americans with our mines than we do anyone else. We have never killed many enemies with mines." This is clearly an irresponsible bill for many reasons, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it, and thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense authorization conference report. I commend Chairman SPENCE and all the conferees for their dedication to revitalizing U.S. national security.

Included in this conference report are provisions to significantly reform the procurement system of the Department of Defense and the civilian agencies of the Federal Government. These provisions are consistent with H.R. 1670, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995, which was a joint initiative of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on National Security. H.R. 1670 passed the House by a vote of 423 to 0 in September of this year.

The language in this conference agreement represents the efforts of many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both chambers who

have joined with us in rejecting the status quo, and who are prepared to lead the way toward reforming a system which, for years, has become increasingly more arcane, more convoluted, and therefore, more costly—both to Government buyers and to businesses wanting to participate in the Federal marketplace.

This conference agreement promotes affordable and common sense approaches to meet our budgetary goals by, among other things: providing for the increased use of commercial items; increasing the competitiveness of U.S. defense products in international markets; eliminating numerous government-unique procedures; and creating a new system for the purchase and management of Federal information technology.

We are in a unique situation today. This could be our only opportunity to see these significant reforms enacted into law. Therefore, it is vital that my colleagues join me in voting for H.R. 1530, the Department of Defense authorization conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman of the Committee if he might enter into a colloquy with me with regard to section 4203 of the bill.

Section 4203 of the bill will greatly simplify and streamline commercial acquisitions under \$5 million. In my view, this is a long-overdue and much needed change. The purchase of commercial items logically lends itself to simplified procedures because there exists a yardstick in the commercial marketplace against which to measure price and quality and to serve as a surrogate for government-unique procedures.

I simply would like to clarify that it is not the intent of this section to encourage agencies to structure their procurements as a series of multiple, low-dollar value purchases so that each component falls under the \$5 million threshold. Am I correct that this is not the intent of the section?

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

Mr. CLINGER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The original proposal offered by the House did not include a threshold for the application of simplified procedures when buying commercial items. While I do not wish to reopen this issue with respect to this bill, no threshold here would have permitted the use of simplified procedures where it was appropriate. Now, we have an arbitrary dividing line between the application of different procedures for the same commercial items.

The problem you raise is a problem generally with the arbitrary application of thresholds. Nonetheless, this language is not intended to allow vendors or Federal buyers to manipulate Federal requirements in order to gain short-term returns that may result from the use of simplified procedures.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have mixed emotions about this conference report. On the one hand, I commend our chairman and ranking member for taking us in to repair the quality of life, the modernization, the pay raises, the COLAs, those kinds of things. But I have a real problem with even the procedure of how we got here with this conference report. I am a conferee. Frankly, I did not even know they were meeting.

I also have problems with outyear obligations. During the hearing process, and I know my friends over there will remember, there was an outrage over the shortfall of the President's budget, \$30 to \$100 billion, if I recall. We coughed up \$7 billion more. That is OK. I think there are some things we could have used that money for that would have accelerated programs and corrected some of the problems that we had out there. However, what we did with this money is essentially create a problem in outyears to the point where we are going to have a train wreck. We are going to find, in fact, where we did little down payments on these programs, and then we issued coupon books that said, "Hey, we are going to pay you some money in the future," I think we are going to have a huge shortfall in outyears.

For instance, \$30 million for ASAT, antisatellite programs, with an additional \$150 million in outyears. That program was not terminated. In fact, I think it brings us into a dangerously serious problem with militarization of space.

The B-2 was given \$493 million, but it is really \$2.5 billion; and \$700 million to Sea Wolf, really it is \$7 billion. Worst of all, ballistic missile defense. Everybody can say we cannot defend against one missile, but one missile is not our threat. Our threat is a cruise missile off the back of a freighter headed down the coast. We have no kind of protection against anything like this.

It also causes us to unilaterally abrogate the START II Treaty. This we could have done better on. There are minds in this institution that have a little bit of military experience. They were never asked to participate in the conference.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1530. On a bipartisan basis, the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, has worked hard to produce a military construction program which makes significant improvements in our military infrastructure and enhances the quality of life for service personnel and their families. At a time when Americans

are being deployed to Bosnia, we must do all we can to support the troops and their families. This bill does that.

Over 9,200 military families will benefit from new construction as well as improvements to existing family housing units. For junior unaccompanied personnel and the Guard and Reserve components, this bill provides for 68 new barracks projects. We have also provided needed child development centers and medical facilities for our personnel. In addition, we also provided important facilities improvements to enhance the readiness of our forces. Without an authorization bill, none of these projects will go forward.

The conference report also provides for an important reform that, over the long-term, will go a long way toward resolving the military housing crisis. Working closely with the Secretary of Defense, we have developed a program to encourage the private sector to develop troop housing and military family housing at installations where there is a certified shortage of quality housing—and we know that there are tens of thousands of such units in our present inventory. The housing crisis is deplorable and we must act to change it.

This legislation will begin to reverse years of benign neglect of our military infrastructure. It is a good bill and deserves the support of the House and the signature of the President.

□ 1330

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

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that section 2836 could be applied to the Naval Air Station in Glenview, IL, with respect to a portion of the property occupied by the Coast Guard.

Mr. HEFLEY. That is correct. The Department of Defense would have the discretion to apply the provision in that manner.

Mr. PORTER. Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the phrase, "for a use similar to a use under the lease," which appears in section 2837(a). Given that the provision is intended to reduce economic burdens on local communities, with regard to Glenview Naval Air Station, would similar use be confined to use as an air facility?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. In that case, "similar use" could only mean continued use as an air facility.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], my distinguished colleague.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, as one of many Democrats who support a strong national defense, I will vote in favor of this measure. While I do not agree with all of the priorities in this bill, I believe it does maintain America's preeminence as the world's one remaining superpower.

On a personal note, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] for the personal courtesy and graciousness which he always extends to every member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would also be remiss, though, if I did not express my serious concern about the process by which this conference report was constructed. To me, far more important than any single measure or issue or program in this bill is the tradition of this House that national defense bills have been developed on a bipartisan basis. I do not believe that was the case in this conference report.

In general, Democratic conferees were excluded from decisions on a number of key national issues. In general, Democratic conferees were not kept adequately informed on the process of this report. Whether intentional or not, this conference report was not put together on a bipartisan basis, and if not corrected, I believe that would be a terribly dangerous precedent for the future of our Nation's defense.

Mr. Speaker, I do not make these comments with any malice toward the majority party leaders of our Committee on National Security. They are good people, they are caring people, and decent people. In fairness, the majority party and its committee leaders have the right to set the tone and the priorities for this defense bill. I have no qualm with that. However, if next year's conference committee process is not more bipartisan than this one was, then I fear greatly that we will have started down a slippery slope toward partisan national defense conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that would be bad for our country, harmful to our national security, and unfair to the men and women serving in the armed forces.

Finally, I want to pay special tribute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN]. The gentleman exercised both personal courage and severe tenacity in fighting for the children of military families. Because of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] and his efforts, we have an impact aid program in this bill that will ensure that the children of military families will receive a quality education.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Personnel.

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that our defense strategists and planners and all of our NCO and officer corps and right down to the men in the field say different things to different Members of this Chamber and the other body. I think it depends on our track record, if it is public, statements off the floor, our whole track record of voting over the years.

They take into consideration the whole person when they tell us things,

because I am being told off committee that the Air Force does want the B-2. I am being told that they do not want people who are infected with the AIDS virus and cannot give blood to us, that they are taken out of airplanes, off ships, that they cannot do anything that they were hired to do. They will never see or touch a gun again, they will never be in a tank or a helicopter. So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot listen to these arguments that nothing changes and they are valuable.

They have said to me, including the commission by former Chief of Staff of the Army Wickham, General Wickham, please release them, and other people who are not strong and healthy and deployable.

On abortions, every single military doctor in Europe and in the Pacific does not want to crush a baby's skull in the mother's womb and abort them. These doctors, like two military doctors on our side of the aisle who serve in the House, say, we are here to defend American life, not to kill American life.

As far as all of the systems we put in here, I just bumped into an Air Force officer at that kiosk by the gate and he said, Congressman DORNAN, you buy them, we fly them. Please, sir, give us the best, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we heard some hypocrisy about supporting the troops from people that have never said that before in their lives in the debate on Bosnia the other night in the midst of a blizzard and 16 out of—15 out of 16 flights being diverted that I wish people would go out more in the field and talk to the men and women who serve us and ask them what they want.

I have a list here of all of the good things we put in this bill, particularly my Subcommittee on Military Personnel, starting with a pay raise. This is a great bill that Mr. SPENCE has crafted. I implore you to vote for it and truly support our men and women in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, let me quickly outline key milestones in this carefully crafted Defense authorization. I would title it "Republicans Restore Defense Spending after Clinton Cuts Combat Readiness in spite of Task Force Eagle going into Bosnia."

No. 1, President Bill Clinton has more than doubled the defense cuts promised by Candidate Clinton—\$120 billion! We stop that erosion.

No. 2, Clinton's defense plan—the Bottom Up Review—should be called the Bottom Out Plan—it's underfunded by as much as \$150 billion. We address that outrage.

No. 3, Republicans, under the leadership of Captain FLOYD SPENCE, have restored \$7 billion to defense, including programs I personally helped initiate such as: additional funding for Army "scout" helicopters—both the OH-58D "Kiowa Warrior" and the sleek RAH-66 "Comanche"; additional funding to build more than a mere 20 B-2 Spirit stealth bombers and equip the B-1B Lancer with precision guided munitions; and additional funding for a near term ballistic missile defense, upper tier capability, using existing Navy Aegis cruisers and destroyers.

No. 4, my Subcommittee on Military Personnel, thanks to the efforts of my ranking Democrat OWEN PICKETT and the hard work of all my subcommittee members improved military quality of life significantly by: the payraise; increasing military housing allowance by 35 percent; setting permanent personnel levels to stop the drawdown; and increasing the number of National Guard technicians.

No. 5, I also included several initiatives that reverse the trend of liberal social experimentation programs within the Department designed to conduct combat operations.

This bill: stops abortions at U.S. military hospitals; stops pay for convicted military felons in the brig or civilian prisons; establishes strict new guidelines for the accountability of our heroic American prisoners of war and missing in action; discharges all non-combat usable, non-deployable AIDS/HIV infected personnel; and awards the AFEM [Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal] to United States veterans of El Salvador.

I would remind those who oppose this bill of the wise words of one of our Founding Fathers, Benjamin Franklin, who warned:

The expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it.

That says it all as to why we should support our troops, support modernization, and support this superb conference report.

So, in closing Mr. Speaker, I submit my remarks specifically related to the Defense authorization bill that lives up to the Republican commitment for a strong national defense presented in the Contract With America. The military personnel provisions within the bill are at the heart of what makes the bill a national security legislative milestone highlighting the differences between Bill Clinton and the Congress on defense issues.

In response to troubling revelations suggesting that the readiness of our units and the quality of life for our service members and their families were approaching dangerous levels, my Subcommittee on Military Personnel responded to address the needs of service members and make readiness a top priority.

Before we get into quality of life and readiness issues, let me assure the over 300 cosponsors of H.R. 2664, the appropriations bill from Mr. YOUNG's shop, that this conference report includes a provision that restores equity to the payment of cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's] to military retirees.

The bill attacks quality of life problems directly with a 2.4-percent pay raise and a series of other enhancements to compensation, including a housing allowance increase that was 35 percent larger than the administration's. The bill also protects members from increased out-of-pocket costs by guaranteeing housing allowance payments so long as the member remains committed to a mortgage or rent payment at a location.

Readiness of our forces was the motivation for language to terminate the dramatic manpower drawdown that eliminated over 630,000 patriotic people

from the Armed Forces. The provision establishes permanent end strength levels that preserve at least key elements of the capability necessary to carry out our Nation's defense strategy of supporting two major regional conflicts.

In terms of our reserve forces, the bill provides increased numbers of full-time military technicians to support deployable units and establishes income protection and dental insurance programs to increase the readiness of individual reservists.

The bill also corrects the societal insult of convicted military felons continuing to receive military pay while serving extended jail sentences.

In addition, finally a critically important section of the bill requires the Secretary of Defense to centralize the oversight and policy responsibility at the Department of Defense level and establish a rigorous process to account for our heroic missing-in-action. This is an issue of intense personal interest to me. It is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a powerful statement in support of our men and women in uniform, to include the 200 deployed to Bosnia and the tens of thousands soon to be deployed to the Balkans and the Adriatic. I strongly implore my colleagues to adopt this conference report and truly support our forces in harms way.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my distinguished colleague who just left the well by saying that the gentleman's articulation is precisely why we ought to have hearings and come to policy based on rational and intelligent discourse as opposed to having a meeting with a particular person off the floor.

That is one of the reasons why we oppose this bill is because there are a number of issues that have been dealt with in the bill, not within the framework and the dignity of the legislative process, but who said what off the floor and in what building. That is not the way to run a government that is considered the greatest democracy in the world.

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

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has asked my Subcommittee on Military Personnel to have hearings on racism in the military, and I agree with the gentleman. It is utterly offensive and awful.

There are some things that we have had so many committee meetings in other committees on, like abortion, that that is why I did not have hearings on that. However, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be one of my star witnesses; we will get together on that.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] said that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

The Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Defense Authorization Act, conference report, H.R. 1530.

My friends, I know that the defense appropriations bill has already been signed into law. I opposed this bill when it was considered on the floor of the House, and I strongly urged the President to veto it. It was a bad bill, and it is a bad law.

Now, we are considering the defense authorization bill. Again, I say to my colleagues, this is a bad bill. It wastes too much money on hardware we don't need, and it prevents investing in our children which we do need.

This agreement calls for \$1.4 billion for the B-2 stealth bomber and \$3.8 billion for a cold-war-style missile defense system. All told, this conference agreement calls for \$7.1 billion more than the Pentagon asked for.

While at the same time, I want to remind you that the new majority's budget cuts title I education funds by \$1.1 billion. Meaning that over 1 million children in our Nation's poorest communities will lose their chance for a decent education.

And, don't forget, that the new majority is cutting \$182 billion in Medicaid funding. Meaning that over 4.4 million children had better not get sick, because, they won't have health care.

And this new majority is shredding the safety net and ending the Federal guarantee of assistance for poor children. The Gingrich welfare reform bill will push at least 1.2 million more children into poverty.

This tells children, if you're poor, don't get sick, don't get hungry, don't get cold, because we don't think you're important.

But here in the Gingrich Congress, if you're a defense contractor, you are really important.

This is an outrage. Where are our priorities?

Vote "no" on the defense authorization conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST], chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the recognition of the gentleman from South Carolina.

To the gentleman, let me say that we have a number of areas of common interest and I appreciate very much the cooperation of the gentleman and his working with us, and that of his staff as well.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the conference report currently before the House does not authorize any operations and maintenance funds for the SR-71 reconnaissance program; is that correct?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is

correct. Neither the House nor the Senate defense authorization bill contained any specific O&M in the authorization for the SR-71. Therefore, the conference report, similarly, does not authorize any funds for this purpose.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that response.

Mr. Speaker, it remains my view that this system is no longer a cost-effective platform for conducting strategic reconnaissance and should be retired to storage in the coming year. I would also note that section 504 of the National Security Act specifically denies the ability to obligate appropriated funds for this purpose without a specific corresponding authorization.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman's assessment and agree that the denial of O&M authorization for the SR-71 should lead to the termination of this program during the fiscal year 1996.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], chairman of our Subcommittee on Readiness.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on National Security for yielding this time to me and commend him for his efforts and his leadership of the committee during this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have presided over the Subcommittee on Readiness and its responsibility for the operation and maintenance accounts which total \$92.3 billion that are involved in this bill.

Reference was made earlier to the fact that there has been a change in the geopolitical environment in which we live today since the termination of the Cold War, and I totally concur with that statement. However, one of the ironies of that fact is that, with it, we have had a higher operational tempo for our military personnel than we did during the height of the cold war.

As we hear complaints about this bill authorizing more than the President requested, we should bear in mind that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have publicly indicated that the defense program of the President over the next 4 or 5 years is \$40 billion to \$60 billion deficient in the modernization accounts which are absolutely essential to what we are going to do.

There are so many good things in this bill that I do not have an opportunity in this 2 minutes to outline all of the things that are there. Let me close this 2 minutes simply by saying that on Wednesday or Thursday evening, not one voice was heard in this Chamber, except to say, we want to support our troops who are shortly to be deployed to Bosnia. That major deployment is going onward, as the peace treaty in Paris has been signed.

The last thing in the world that we should contemplate doing would be not to pass this bill to provide them with the things that they need, and not to shatter their morale by indicating, by the defeat of this bill, that we are not interested in their quality of life, that we are not interested in their pay raise, that we are not interested in providing them the equipment which they need.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Military Readiness Subcommittee, I rise in strong support of this conference report and urge its adoption.

Yesterday, the Bosnia peace agreement was signed in Paris.

Today, the deployment of 20,000 United States forces to Bosnia will commence in earnest. U.S. troops are embarking on a mission of uncertain outcome and of significant risk. They will do their duty proudly and with honor, and with the belief that their Government will provide them the necessary resources and support to accomplish their difficult task.

It is the responsibility of this Congress and the President to keep faith with our military personnel and demonstrate our commitment to their welfare and the welfare of their families.

I firmly believe the conference report on H.R. 1530, the Fiscal Year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act does this. It ensure force readiness and it improves the quality of life for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

Press reports that President Clinton intends to veto this authorization bill are troubling. A veto of this measure would be inconsistent with supporting the U.S. forces he is sending into harm's way.

This bill takes concrete action in support of our forces. Vote "yes" on adoption of the conference report on H.R. 1530.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

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

Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Readiness, I commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] for the effort he made to finalize the conference report. The gentleman did yeoman duty under difficult circumstances, and I am honored to count him not only as my colleague, but as my friend.

Mr. Speaker, we enter the year on a less than light note with a barrage of allegations questioning the readiness of our Armed Forces.

□ 1345

During a series of hearings early in the year, the committee and our subcommittee learned that many of these allegations simply were not true.

Nevertheless, we can always do better. Anyone who reads the House version of the bill, as well as the conference report, will find that we have enhanced readiness. Operations, maintenance and training accounts are fully funded. Real property maintenance, depot maintenance and base operations support have been strengthened. We established a short-term financing mech-

anism to cover initial costs of continuing operations and prevent shortfalls like those we experienced at the end of last year.

Some will remember this is something I tired to do 2 years ago as chairman of the Investigations Subcommittee.

We also took a variety of steps to improve quality of life for military personnel and their families, and we included a number of initiatives that will save money by ensuring more efficient use of DOD resources.

All of us are concerned with DOD's privatization initiatives, which we will see more of, by the way, in the coming years. However, one of the most important issues before our subcommittee this year involved a 60-40 split as it pertains to government depots. Our committee position proved to be a good starting point for what was finally accepted by the conference.

The conference report requires DOD to study the issue and to develop a plan which must be approved by Congress before it can be implemented. That represents a victory for the bipartisan depot caucus represented by Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WATTS, Mrs. FOWLER, and others. It puts DOD on notice that Congress will take a more balanced, responsible approach to this issue.

Although I do not like everything in this bill, I ask for your support. That is one thing that we can get together on, supporting the armed services of this country.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from some people on the other side of the aisle in a bipartisan way who are supporting this bill.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement and another strong defender of defense in this country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I compliment him, the chairman of this committee. I compliment the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

I thank and congratulate the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee on which I have the privilege of being the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], for the excellent work that we have done; to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], on whose subcommittee I serve, for his persistence on the MIA issue.

This is a good bill. It is not just because it includes good language for the B-2 that it takes a step forward. But we have spent a great part of this week talking about supporting the troops.

This bill supports the troops. It gives them a pay raise. It helps with their family allowance. It supports the families better. It adds to the figure that was going down regarding maintenance and training.

Mr. Speaker, we have the finest military ever known in this country. This

bill will help keep us a very, very strong and fine military for those arduous duties that are expected of these fine young men and women.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the House Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I am proud of key elements of this bill which after the military construction program and focus on improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families.

This bill would provide both short and long term solutions to a critical problem that impacts the retention and readiness of our Armed Forces.

By focusing on improvements to troop and military families, and setting strict priorities within the military construction program, we ensure that the housing backlog is addressed and quality of life is improved.

Furthermore, the bill includes a series of new authorities which would encourage the private sector to develop housing for unaccompanied personnel and military families at installations where there is a certified shortage of quality housing.

This initiative has strong bipartisan support, including the support of the Secretary of Defense.

This bill is not perfect, but it is a good bill that places priority on improving readiness and the quality of life programs that impact our personnel and their families.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a very strong proponent of the military and especially R&D.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. We have heard three major issues raised here.

First of all, we raised the issue of spending money on the military as opposed to jobs. I would ask my colleagues to express that feeling to the 600,000 union workers who have lost their jobs in the last 8 years, primarily in the UAW and the Machinists, because of defense cuts.

We have heard about budgetary increases. I would ask my colleagues not to ask the political appointees at the Pentagon but to ask the service chiefs, each one of whom came to us personally and asked for the additional funding that we plused up.

But my real concern is the outrage expressed by several of our colleagues

over this bill violating treaties. This bill in no way violates any treaty of this country. Period. Not the ABM treaty, not the START Treaty.

In fact, we have now boxed the administration into an impossible position for them. Because now, in agreement with Senator NUNN and the administration over the language, we have removed all but one key difference, and that is a date certain for deploying a system, not a system that will violate the ABM treaty but a system in line with what the Russians already have.

The Russians have the world's only operational ABM system, and what we have done now is, we have allowed for the deployment of a similar system that the Army and the Air Force have both said on the record they could do from a single site, not in violation of the ABM treaty; in the Air Force case at a cost of \$2.25 billion over 4 years, in the Army's case using FAD at a cost of \$5 billion over 4 years.

The reason the administration is threatening a veto, Mr. Speaker, is very simple and very clear: They are now between a rock and a hard place. We have removed all the rhetoric. There is no more contention that this violates any treaty, because Bob Bell and the administration knows full well it does not. What this bill simply says is, we want to have the same potential to defend the American people that the Russians have within the confines of the ABM treaty.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to put up or shut up, and protect the people or veto this bill.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the defense authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have sat on this floor and listened to the Gingrich Republicans talk about a balanced budget day after day after day. Where are they today?

The Gingrich Republicans want to cut Medicare and increase military spending. They want to cut student loans and increase military spending. They want to cut Medicaid and increase military spending. They want to cut education and increase military spending. Billions of dollars for new and expanded weapons systems, the B-2, the C-17, *Seawolf*, Trident, and on and on and on.

Think about it. You simply cannot increase military spending, give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans and balance the budget. Speaker GINGRICH's math simply does not add up. I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

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

Could the chairman please describe the outcome reached by the conferees on the B-2 bomber program?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the conference outcome on the B-2 successfully establishes the conditions necessary to permit the production of additional B-2 bombers beyond the currently authorized 20 aircraft. To achieve this end, the conference report has authorized an additional \$493 million in procurement funds, repealed existing statutory restrictions on the procurement of long-lead items and repealed the statutory caps on the number of B-2's that can be acquired and on the total program cost.

There are several key issues, however, that require clarification for the legislative record. First, as both the bill and report language clearly indicates, the fence on the obligation of B-2 funds until March 31, 1996, applies only to the \$493 million in additional fiscal year 1996 procurement funds. In no way does this fence impact obligation of prior-year B-2 funding.

Therefore, the balance of the \$125 million authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1995 to sustain the B-2 industrial base is available immediately for such purposes. The use of the phrase "merge with the \$493 million" in no way captures any prior-year funding and refers only to the use of those funds for the same purpose as the \$493 million.

Second, I would expect the Department of Defense to act expeditiously in the months ahead to sustain B-2 industrial base in such a way as to protect the option to utilize the \$493 million to procure long-lead items for additional B-2 aircraft.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the chairman. Is it therefore the chairman's perspective that the purpose for which the additional \$493 million is being authorized is the facilitization and acquisition of long-lead items necessary to procure additional B-2 aircraft if such a decision is made in the future?

Mr. SPENCE. If the gentleman would yield. Consistent with the purposes specified in House Report 104-131 and House Report 104-208, the increased authorized of \$493 million for the program is expressly for the purpose of beginning the process of reestablishing critical elements of the B-2 production line and procuring long-lead items consistent with the acquisition of additional B-2 aircraft.

Mr. MCKEON. I thank the chairman. In the interest of time, I ask that the remainder of our colloquy be placed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that colloquies cannot be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MCKEON. I ask that the remainder of the statement be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, each Member may submit his own statement in the RECORD.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would finish with the statement that the purpose for which the additional \$493 million is being authorized

is the facilitization and acquisition of long-lead items necessary to procure additional B-2 aircraft if such a decision is made in the future. This is consistent with the purposes specified in House Report 104-131 and House Report 104-208, which indicate that the increased authorization of \$493 million for the program is expressly for the purpose of beginning the process of reestablishing critical elements of the B-2 production line and procuring long-lead items consistent with the acquisition of additional B-2 aircraft.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take these 2 minutes to respond to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania with respect to his comments regarding ballistic missile defense.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, says that it directs the national missile defense to be operationally effective in defending all 50 States including Hawaii and Alaska.

Now, any rational human being would understand that in order to protect 50 States, including Alaska and Hawaii, would require the deployment of a system that goes beyond one site. Once you move to multiple sites, you are abrogating the ABM treaty, No. 1.

The second point, the gentleman asserted that the Russians have the capacity to defend their Nation. When you go back, Mr. Speaker, to the history of the ABM treaty, the Russians have the capacity to defend one site, Moscow, not their nation.

The third point I would like to make. We engage in artfully drawn language so that the term, explicit and implicit, what we know is how this legislation is drafted to protect all 50 States, you are going to have to go to multiple sites. No matter how you split that, that is abrogating the ABM treaty.

Mr. Speaker, one other point that I would make on the ABM. Once you move to multiple sites, I would suggest and challenge any economic analyst in this country to look at what my colleagues have placed in this bill regarding ballistic missile defense. There is no money planned for the out years. This is a budget buster of their own budget because they simply get the nose under the tent this year with a policy statement and in the out years you are talking about tens of billions of dollars that have not been planned for.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. The Army and the Air Force have both testified they can deploy a single site to protect all 50 States.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS].

□ 1400

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, what better time to debate the merits of a bill that supports our military personnel through its provision of pay, housing, and other benefits.

The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, remembers her defenders—the men and women of our Nation's Armed Forces.

This bill increases basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence by 2.4 percent, increases basic allowance for quarters by 5.2 percent, and gives thousands of military members housing choices that were previously unavailable.

It extends the authority for several special pay and bonus programs, corrects the military cost-of-living-adjustment disparity between military and Federal civilian retirees, increases certain aspects of the Montgomery G.I. bill educational assistance, and expands the authority for improvements to military housing.

In his speech accepting the Republican Vice Presidential nomination, Calvin Coolidge said, "the Nation which forgets its defenders will be itself forgotten."

Please support the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise concerning the passage of this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

(Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, in 30 seconds I cannot say much. Let me say this, let me assure my colleagues this is a good bill.

In tribute, respect and honor of the 21st TAACOM, my reserve unit that went to the gulf war, 2 hours ago I learned they are now headed to Europe to, Bosnia. So let me say I wish them Godspeed. I will be with you on Sunday. I will always be with you in spirit. We have shared a bond and union together that none of us will ever forget.

So when we stand on this floor and talk about support of the troops, it really comes down to moments like this. Do we believe in the modernization of equipment, giving you what you need and the resources you need to protect the force, for you to do your job, to do it well and to do it proudly? We will be there with you.

Please, support this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], our top gun.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, you know, there has been a longtime debate, a legitimate debate, on whether

we need a strong national defense or a socialistic model for this country. But when it comes to the point where defense has been cut so deeply, \$177 billion, we are \$200 billion below the Bottom-Up Review, then we need to add the dollars to protect our kids.

Look at what it costs to go to Haiti, look what it cost, the billions of dollars in Somalia. Bosnia is going to cost billions of dollars.

Where do you think that money comes from? Many of us did not support any of those activities, but yet some of those that would fight for more dollars for the social programs supported those issues, and that is a legitimate debate. But we also need to protect our kids, and that is what I talked about the other night in the Bosnia issue when it comes time to protect our soldiers so they do not come back in body bags, and we give them the wherewithal to come back, then we do it.

This bill does that, and I ask for support.

Among the many vital programs that the fiscal year 1996 Defense Authorization Conference Report moves forward is the B-2 stealth bomber program. The conference report provides \$493 million in additional B-2 procurement authorization in order to permit the continuation of the B-2 production beyond 20 aircraft.

The conferees also repealed the previous restrictions on the procurement of long-lead items for the B-2 program and the standing cap on the numbers of bombers that would be produced. We clearly feel that the B-2 program, which provides our Air Force with the technological edge and the security to accomplish its missions without the massive air and ground support that other bombers require, should move forward beyond 20 aircraft.

The B-2 production facilities are currently operating under the balance of the \$125 million in fiscal 1995 funds that were provided for the program last year. In further authorizing the B-2 program for fiscal 1996, the conferees fenced the availability of the \$493 million authorization, and will not preclude the Department of Defense [DOD] from acting to sustain the industrial base and the production and procurement activity necessary to smoothly maintain the B-2 production program.

In fact, the conferees expect that, based upon our realization of the need for a continuing B-2 program, the DOD will act to sustain the B-2 industrial base activity until the new funds are made available. This will allow the ongoing program operations to continue and will prevent the additional costs that the DOD would incur if it had to restart any portion of the industrial base's activities.

The B-2 stealth bomber is an important part of this Congress' renewed effort to maintain a sound and solid American defense. Our commitment to a reinvigorated, modern stock of defense assets coupled with our dedication to solid core readiness, an improved quality of life for our service people, and a Pentagon that runs like a business, will help ensure our national security for decades to come.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY].

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to get right to the point. I think

we have seen over the last 10 years a 35-percent real cut in defense spending, but that only masks part of the problem because we have seen about a 70 percent decline in spending on procurement from the standpoint of our Navy and shipbuilding that has brought us to an absolute low point in terms half domestic capability, our industrial base to build naval ships.

I think that one of the important things about this authorization is that it finally says enough is enough, and it starts to rebuild the important defense component represented by naval shipbuilding.

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

Mr. Speaker, we come to the end of the debate on this conference report to the bill, H.R. 1530, and I would end the way I began. I rise in opposition to this conference report on procedural grounds and on substantive grounds.

I indicated that I would not go into the procedural issues. I think, on a collegial basis, my colleagues and I need to sit down, close the door, and hammer these procedural issues out so we move beyond them and we do not make the same mistakes as we did this year. I realize that it is a learning curve.

With respect to the substantive issues, I would point out to my colleagues that the administration does, indeed, plan to veto this bill. Two very specific reasons for the veto, Mr. Speaker: I would reiterate, the administration has expressed serious concerns about the impact of the proposed conference report language on Russian consideration of the START-II treaty which is designed to produce a major reduction in Russian nuclear weapons.

Why we would want to send the wrong message in that regard when we owe it to ourselves, our children, and our children's children to engage in major reductions of nuclear weapons from this planet is a mystery to this gentleman.

Second, the administration is also concerned, as I have stated earlier, that this language could, indeed, lead the Russians to abandon other arms control agreements if they conclude that it is, indeed, United States policy to take unilateral action to abandon or otherwise walk away from the ABM Treaty.

These are awesome and important issues and for those reasons, alone, my colleagues ought to vote against this conference report.

As I stated earlier, we find ourselves, Mr. Speaker, in the context of the post-cold war world. An enormous gift has been given us. We now have an enormous opportunity to think boldly and to take the world into the future contemplating peace, not contemplating war. If you look at this budget, you will see a number of cold war relics being pushed forward in this budget at a time when our country is standing still, holding its breath about the budget negotiations that are taking place between the administration and the legislative branch of Government.

This bill purports to increase the military budget by \$7 billion at a time when we spend as much as all the rest of the world combined and when you add in our allies we spend in excess of 80 percent of the world's military budget. We outspend any potential adversary 4 to 1.

Yes, there are some good things in this bill. There are some good quality-of-life things in this bill. But a \$7 billion increase is not one of them. Potential abrogation of the ABM Treaty is not one of them. Sending the wrong message so the Russians back off of START-II is, indeed, not one of them. Engaging in placing weapons systems forward in this bill that go far beyond any balanced budget implications that my colleagues have talked about in other areas is certainly, indeed, not one of them. To engage in a cold war approach to the world when we are in a post-cold-war environment, trying to find new ways to relate to each other, to move beyond war to peace and beyond waramaking to peacemaking and beyond risking a war to risking peace are all of the reasons why I would suggest that my colleagues oppose this conference report, for procedural issues, there are substantive, and very much of concern to this gentleman, and on the substantive grounds that I have had.

With those remarks, again I would urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a leader on the appropriations defense issue, opposes the bill. The gentleman from the intelligence committee opposes this bill. My distinguished colleague, who is a counterpart on this committee as ranking minority member in the other body, also opposes this conference report. This ought to give rise to serious concern that we have gone down the wrong path in this conference.

I urge my colleagues to follow us and vote against the conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

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

I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 1530, fiscal year 1996, and I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the distinguished chairman of the committee, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], and the conferees for a great job. And I would like to note that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is the first Republican chairman of this committee since Dewey Short back in 1953, and he has been doing an outstanding job.

I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

The conference report before us today retains the emphasis on a strong national de-

fense, procurement reform, and quality of life for our troops and their families that merited the strong support H.R. 1530 received in the House earlier this year.

This conference report will improve the quality of life for our troops and their families by providing a 2.4-percent military pay raise, enhancing military housing and medical benefits, providing equity in COLA payments for our military retirees, and increased funding for family housing. As the holiday season approaches and our Nation deploys troops in Bosnia, I can think of no better time to show our troops and their families that we support them by the passage of this conference report.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this conference report will insure a strong national defense, and provide a number of important process and structural Pentagon reforms necessary to increase the Pentagon's efficiency and effectiveness.

Finally, I would like to point out to my colleagues that included in this conference report are important DOD reforms with regard to POW-MIA procedures. As my colleagues may recall I introduced H.R. 945, the Missing Service Personnel Act, earlier this year, based upon my belief that improvements were needed in the process by which DOD accounts for our American service members who are prisoners of war or missing in action.

Since the Vietnam war, Congress has struggled to find ways for obtaining the full accounting of American servicemen reportedly still missing. By adopting the provisions contained in H.R. 945 the conference report will ensure that a full accounting is done, not only for those who are missing from Vietnam, but from all wars since World War II.

This provision is strongly supported by the American Legion, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the National League of Families, as well as many other POW/MIA organizations.

For all of the aforesaid reasons, for the families and troops who are currently being deployed to Bosnia, and for the families of those still missing from past military deployments, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], who is the chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, well, here we are. It is about 10 years since the buildup under President Ronald Reagan, and for the Members who have talked about the expenditures and how we are busting the budget and spending too much money, this defense bill is about \$100 billion less in real dollars than the 1986 defense budget.

I think if we came in today, we have heard almost exactly the same speeches that we heard 10 years ago when the budget was \$100 billion more. I think if we cut it by \$100 billion on the floor in the next 3 minutes, we would still have the same feelings and the same speeches on each side.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman will yield, I promise you I would back off if you do that.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. Let me commend the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for his work during the year and our great chair-

man, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], who, with his modesty and his good sense of humor and his great integrity, has held this committee together and worked through the conference process; my old friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], who has had more meetings in his office than we have in mine on issues that affect this committee; and the young men and women in uniform, folks, this is a good bill. It provides equipment. It provides the best in terms of expanding America's airpower, our seapower, our airlift, our ammunition, our basic spares, all the things that are needed by people in uniform to project American power and carry out American foreign policy.

In this brave new world that we have all talked about, where are we? We are engaged in a policy in Bosnia that resolves down to a man and a weapon with a bayonet on the end of it. That is projection of American power through American uniformed service people.

Now, this is the bill that supports the troops. This has the 2.4-percent pay raise. It has the housing allowance.

Let me just tell you, none of our troops read concurrent resolutions. They do read pay raises.

Please, support the troops. Support American strength. Vote for this conference report.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that section 2838 of H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, reflects a provision I had offered in the House version of the bill designed to speed up the redevelopment process once a military base is closed.

Anyone who has lived through a base closure process, as I have, knows that one of the most difficult challenges in trying to cope with the various layers of Federal bureaucracy once the actual decision has been made to close the base. At the heart of the problem lies the Stewart M. McKinney Homeless Act, which virtually has guaranteed that homeless providers have a chance to express interest in property on closing bases regardless of what the local community has in mind in the way of redevelopment plans. As part of this whole process, the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] has been able to hold up any transfer of property for reuse purposes until it was satisfied that all possible uses for the homeless—no matter how remote—were included in a base redevelopment plan.

I introduced legislation, which passed the House of Representatives overwhelmingly, designed to lessen the role of HUD and to give more authority to local redevelopment authorities planning for the reuse of closed military bases. Although the Clinton administration believed my amendment was too strong, the Department of Defense worked on the Senate side to develop alternative language that had a similar purpose, that is, to make the base reuse process more friendly to local communities and less under the control of HUD and its homeless constituencies around the country.

The final version as approved by the conferees is consistent with my purpose. HUD no longer will have the final say in the distribution

of real property on closing military bases. Instead, DOD will have the final authority for such disposal, but only after close consultation with the local community and after deferring to the redevelopment goals as set forth in the local redevelopment authority's reuse plan.

Although the base reuse process is far from perfect, I believe the section 2838 will strengthen the role of the local community and in doing so will help expedite the reuse process. Economically productive activities will begin much more quickly at closing military installations. In my view, the fundamental purpose of base reuse should be the restoration of lost economic activity in the local community. I believe section 2838 helps focus the reuse process on this objective, and I am proud to have played a role in its adoption.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this measure. Without a doubt, our military preparedness is of great importance. This bill will most certainly ensure such. However, this bill goes beyond ensuring our military might—this bill is nothing more than billions of dollars' worth of silver spoons for defense contractors. I wish the Republican majority felt that providing for our elderly, poor, and children was at least as important as providing for the profit margins of defense contractors.

With telling irony, this legislation guarantees our military strength while also establishing our leadership in insensitivity and lack of regard for individual rights. The limitations on abortions for military officers who serve overseas is an egregious assault on the personal liberties of those who risk their personal well-being to serve all of us.

The callous proposal to discharge military personnel who have tested positive for HIV is unfair, if not amoral. What became of judging a person based upon his character and ability? It was not that long ago that this country experienced periods of civil unrest and strife in order that all people would be treated equally. Mr. Speaker, this provision is a step backward for a civilized society. As an American, I am appalled and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the American people will not be fooled.

I urge my colleagues to recommit this measure with the hope that we can consider an agreement that guarantees our military effectiveness, while also reflecting our national priorities, and protecting our ideals of personal liberty and fairness of treatment.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. However, my support of this legislation is tempered somewhat because it does have serious problems that have to be addressed.

I am very happy with the improvements to quality of life for our troops and their families in this legislation. The conference report provides a 2.4 percent military pay raise, enhances military housing and medical benefits, provides equity in COLA payments for our military retirees and increases funding for family housing, barracks and other critical military family activities. I have long been a supporter of these type of initiatives for our military as my record on the House Armed Services Committee and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction demonstrates.

I also am in support of the procurement reform provisions in this legislation. The conference report would: increase the Government's use of commercial items by simplifying procedures and eliminating unnecessary audit

requirements, increase the competitiveness of U.S. defense products in international markets, eliminate costly, burdensome paperwork requirements, and create a new system for the purchase and management of Federal information technology. This is something that the Department of Defense sorely needs.

This legislation also includes a provision important to my home-district. It directs the Department of the Army to cede a 22-acre parcel of land to the Department of Veterans Affairs for the purposes of expanding the Fort Bliss National Cemetery. This would extend the longevity of the cemetery to the year 2020. I am very grateful to the chairman and the ranking member of the National Defense Committee for including this provision in the legislation. I, and the veterans of my community, are extremely grateful for this provision.

However, this conference report does have its problems.

The administration has identified several areas of concern which also trouble me. For one, the command and control provisions governing the operation of U.S. troops during peacekeeping operations. This provision impinges upon the role of the President as Commander in Chief in a manner that could be unconstitutional.

Also, the ballistic missile defense provisions are troubling to the administration. The bill would require the deployment of a national missile defense system by the year 2003. Such a system would constitute unilateral abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty. This could give the Russians reasons to withdraw their support for START II, a dangerous consequence.

The Republican majority, however, did not address these objections in conference. This, even after the repeated insistence of the administration. As a result, the President has threatened a veto of this legislation. If it comes to that, I will have to side with my President.

Other provisions which trouble me include:

Department of Defense environmental programs which are underfunded in this bill. There are multi-year environmental cleanups underway at Fort Bliss, TX, located in my congressional district, which could be jeopardized if these provisions are enacted into law;

The termination of the Technology Reinvestment Program [TRP]. This program has been enormously successful in my congressional district with leading manufacturers and the University of Texas at El Paso participating in the program. In the current fiscal year, only \$195 million is provided to complete pending projects;

The requirement of the discharging of members of the Armed Forces who have the HIV-1 virus. This is unnecessary and discriminatory. I have long maintained that this is contrary to the Constitution's guarantee of equality to all Americans. This would preclude the military from utilizing military personnel who are completely functional in their jobs and in whom the military have invested training resources; and

Abortion provisions which would amend permanent law to include the restrictions on the use of Department of Defense facilities for abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is in danger. This issue was incorporated in the bill without a single hearing on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation for now, but await the President's position statement regarding this legislation.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report includes provisions on Government-wide procurement reform, on which I was a conferee. The procurement provisions in the defense authorization conference agreement are an improvement over the most recent procurement bill to pass this House, H.R. 1670.

The conference agreement retains the current statutory definition of full and open competition. The agreement requires Federal agencies to purchase commercial items using full and open competition. It improves Government procurement practices by including my language to require Federal agencies to use cost effective value engineering procedures.

The agreement also incorporates my language retaining the knowing standard for criminal violations of our procurement integrity laws. It includes a provision drafted by Representative MALONEY that improves the performance capability of the frontline contracting personnel. In addition, the agreement includes Representative SPRATT's pilot program on military pay.

Mr. Speaker, since I became the ranking Democratic member on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, I have supported procurement reform. However, I have fought vigorously in committee, on the House floor, and in conference to preserve the current statutory definition of full and open competition.

After a long and hard struggle, I am pleased to report that the conferees have agreed not to make any changes to the Competition and Contracting Act's definition of full and open competition. The report does contain a provision requiring that the Federal acquisition regulation ensure that full and open competition is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the need to efficiently fulfill the Government's requirements. This language should not be interpreted as any limitation to full and open competition, as the statement of managers makes clear.

Let me read from the statement of managers, quote:

The provision would direct that the Federal Acquisition Regulation ensure that the requirement to obtain full and open competition is implemented in a manner that is consistent with the need to efficiently fulfill the governments' requirements.

This provision makes no change to the requirement for full and open competition or the definition of full and open competition.

I am pleased that the conferees agreed with me that changing the definition and requirements for full and open competition was wrong and would have turned back the clock on procurement reform.

Mr. Speaker, I do have concerns about two provisions in this agreement. The conference report permits the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to waive laws relating to commercial off-the-shelf items that impose government unique policies on persons who have been awarded contracts. This language would permit the Administrator to waive critical laws like the Prompt Pay Act, Buy American Act, the Trade Agreements Act, and subcontracting plan requirements for small businesses.

I believe it is bad public policy to allow any administration to determine what laws it will enforce and what laws it will not. That is the

constitutional responsibility of Congress, not the executive branch.

My other major concern involves the elimination of the protest jurisdiction of the General Services Administration Board of Contract Appeals. The GSA board was established in 1984 because of a bipartisan consensus that GAO was ineffective in deciding protests involving computers and telecommunications. GAO lacks the power to compel both the production of testimony as well as documents from third parties. As an arm of the Congress, GAO is constitutionally prohibited from ordering executive agencies to do anything. I am concerned that with a weakened bid protest system agency bureaucrats will be tempted to cut corners and will begin favoring certain companies over others.

Mr. Speaker, while I intend to oppose this conference report, I am pleased that the procurement language in the conference agreement retains full and open competition, the cornerstone of our procurement system.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the provision in the defense authorization conference report which prohibits personnel or dependents from obtaining abortions at U.S. facilities abroad—even if the woman pays all the costs—except to save the life of the woman or in cases of rape or incest.

This ban discriminates against women who have volunteered to serve their country by prohibiting them from exercising their legally protected right to choose. The issue at hand is not about who should pay for the abortion—Department of Defense appropriations bills have prohibited the use of funds to perform abortions at military hospitals in almost all cases since 1979—or whether it is a constitutionally protected right, but whether women who serve overseas will have access to the same medical care they deserve.

This provision overturns the January 1993 Executive order by President Clinton permitting abortions at U.S. military installations overseas, if the procedure was paid for privately by the woman and returns to the policy followed by the Reagan administration in the 1980's.

Prohibiting women from using their own funds to obtain abortion services at overseas military facilities endangers their health. Women stationed overseas depend on their base hospitals for medical care, and are often situated in areas where local facilities are inadequate or unavailable. This policy may result in a woman facing a crisis pregnancy endangering her life, to seek out an illegal or unsafe procedure. It is of no advantage to our military forces to expose female service members to medical conditions that pose a substantial risk of infection, illness, or even death.

This bill sends a clear message to American military women: You can fight for your country, you can die for your country but you cannot get access to a full range of medical services when stationed overseas. Is this really the message we want to send to the brave women serving this Nation? I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for 1996.

I cannot support a bill which calls for spending \$7 billion more of defense

than even the Pentagon has requested. I believe that is the height of absurdity in the current fiscal climate. The \$495 million in long-lead funding for future B-2 bombers is particularly egregious. This bill also actively encourages the Pentagon to violate the ABM treaty. This may cause a serious setback for international nonproliferation efforts, as Russia has declared it will not ratify the START II accord if we abrogate the ABM treaty. In yet another blow to reproductive freedom, this conference report denies the constitutional right of choice to women serving our country by prohibiting women from obtaining abortions at U.S. military facilities.

This report contains major reforms to Government-wide procurement laws, on which I was proud to be named a conferee. These reforms are not perfect, and would undoubtedly be significantly different if Democrats had been doing the drafting. However, they represent an improvement over H.R. 1670 in a number of ways and I would like to commend Ranking Member COLLINS and Chairman CLINGER for their hard work on these issues.

The House bill dramatically altered the full and open competition standard which was created in the landmark Competition in Contracting Act of 1984. This standard has ensured the Federal Government the best return on its dollar for over a decade while at the same time allowed the full participation of small businesses in Federal acquisition. I opposed this change, along with Members from both sides of the aisle. I am glad that, while recognizing the Government's interest in efficient procurement practices, this conference report leaves the full and open competition standard essentially unchanged.

I remain concerned about the use of the streamlined procedures for the purchase of commercial items authorized by this bill. I would have preferred to have had a much lower threshold than the \$5 million contained in this report. But at least we have some threshold, the House passed version contained none at all. The 3-year sunset of this provision, contained in this bill, is also a good idea.

This conference report modifies the repeal of recoupment of research and development costs on U.S. weapons systems contained in the House bill. It requires off-sets through the year 2005 and grants only a limited waiver. I offered an amendment to the House bill which would have had a very similar effect and am glad that this provision is included in the report.

I am less pleased with other procurement provisions in this bill. This bill gives the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy the authority to waive numerous laws relating to procurement of commercial items. This could significantly alter the system without enactment of legislation, raising troubling constitutional questions.

This conference report also eliminates the jurisdiction of the General Services Board of Contract Appeals over bid protests, consolidating bid protest hearings in the GAO. I much preferred the approach of the original House bill on this issue—consolidating bid protests and contract appeals into two boards, one for defense and one civilian.

Mr. Chairman, on a different vehicle and with some minor modifications I might well support many of the procurement reforms included in this conference report. I must however oppose this defense authorization conference report.

One final note. I am pleased that this conference report includes the House-passed language establishing the Civilian Marksmanship Program as a non-profit corporation. As a long-time critic of this program, I plan to monitor the transition of the National Rifle Board very closely. I have worked hard to get this boondoggle out of the Army and to eliminate its annual \$2.5 million appropriation. While not perfect, this provision is a big step in the right direction.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank and commend the distinguished chairman of the House National Security Committee, Mr. Spence, the ranking minority member, Mr. DELLUMS and my colleagues on the House National Security Committee for bringing this important conference report to the House floor.

In particular, I want to thank Chairman SPENCE for his leadership in helping to ensure that the necessary funding has been provided to continue a very important program within the Department of the Army aimed at evaluating and embracing new weapons and munitions technology. Working with our colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee, Chairman SPENCE included in this year's national security conference report an additional \$3 million for program element 602624A, the Weapons and Munition Technology Program within the Department of the Army.

I am proud to report that much of the Army's Weapons and Munitions Technology Program is undertaken at the U.S. Army Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center [ARDEC] located at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

This program element within the Department of the Army undertakes several important initiatives designed to strengthen the Army's technology base by developing key technologies that will increase the lethality and survivability of future artillery weapons, munitions, and armaments for ground combat vehicles and aircraft.

It is my hope that with the additional funds authorized by Chairman SPENCE and his colleagues, Picatinny Arsenal will undertake a new era of investigation involving life-cycle assessment, a promising mechanism for managing future defense-related environmental challenges. To achieve advancements in life-cycle

weapons management, the Dean Gallo Center for Life-Cycle Environmental Technologies will be developed through a formal partnership between ARDEC and the New Jersey Institute of Technology [NJIT] in Newark, NJ. The purpose of the Gallo Center will be to conduct research, facilitate technology development, and to encourage industrial application of new methods and processes, new materials, and new technologies for meeting the clean manufacturing needs of both the military and the private sector.

I look forward to working with Chairman SPENCE and Mr. DELLUMS and members of the National Security Committee to ensure that this model program can play a valuable role in assisting DOD to manage current environmental challenges and develop new capabilities to meet future challenges.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I support the provisions to sell Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, better known as Elk Hills, that appear in H.R. 1530. I am particularly pleased that Congress is not only taking steps to ensure taxpayers get the maximum value for this asset but is finally dealing with California's long-standing interest in Elk Hills.

Elk Hills is in my congressional district and I know it intimately. I am pleased that the 104th Congress is finally dealing with the issue of ensuring that taxpayers get fair value for Elk Hills, something I have sought and in the past introduced legislation to seek. I am particularly pleased to see that the conferees set aside 9 percent of net proceeds, representing the proportion of oil produced by the school lands within the Federal Government's share of the Elk Hills reserve for possible compensation to California for its claims to lands within Elk Hills. California members of both parties have sought this kind of compensation during the last decade because the Federal Government never delivered on its promises to the State.

The history of Elk Hills makes it quite clear that California has a legitimate claim to compensation. California was granted sections of land throughout the State by Act of Congress in 1853 to support education, long before the creation of the reserve. The grant was identical to other grants made by the Federal Government to other States as they entered the union.

The Federal Government never delivered on the promise. Lands in Elk Hills were withdrawn in 1909 and 1912 for creation of the naval petroleum reserve. California never got appropriate compensation for its rights. Even after the Federal Government opened Elk Hills to production in 1976, ending any semblance of its use as a naval petroleum reserve, California's claim remained outstanding.

The importance of paying these claims has been recognized by Presidents and Members of this body during the past decade and I hope Congress will also choose to honor it. President Bush, after I met with officials in his administration, agreed to provide California with part of the bonuses and royalties from leasing Elk Hills. His 1992 budget explicitly said California would receive these payments and the essence of what he agreed to do was contained in a bill I introduced to facilitate leasing the reserve. President Clinton's own proposal to sell Elk Hills, submitted to the Speaker this spring, provides compensation for California.

Further, this issue goes beyond equity to the very heart of what our National Security

colleagues seek to accomplish by selling Elk Hills. Failing to recognize the equity of having the Federal Government live up to its obligations here could severely damage prospects for getting the maximum value out of Elk Hills for taxpayers. The State still regards its claim to the two sections as good. Once the Federal Government sells Elk Hills, there is no possible pretense that Elk Hills is a naval petroleum reserve.

California's claim clouds the title to Elk Hills and will discourage a bidder from offering full value for the reserve. Our State attorney general's office is confident the State has a claim that can be successfully pursued; the Federal court case that the State lost related to the State's claim that the naval petroleum reserve's status had been effectively extinguished by commercial production. That earlier suit did not deal with actual termination of the reserve's status through sale to private industry and the merits of the State's interest in these lands were never reached. Any potential buyer will take these matters into account and that in turn will hurt the taxpayers' interest. No bidder will want to be exposed to the risk of paying twice for the same asset.

The only way to avoid these problems is to do the right thing and provide a mechanism for fairly resolving the State's claims. The conference report does precisely that through a mechanism employing an escrow of net proceeds from a sale of Elk Hills.

The conference deals with the State's claims in a straight forward manner. Nine percent of the net sale proceeds are set aside in a special account for payment to California for its teachers retirement fund, which, by California law, is where the proceeds will go. The only way California could get any of the money would be to settle its claims with the United States or win a court case on this issue. An explicit settlement process, included in the bill prevents delays in bargaining by requiring the Federal Government to offer to settle California's claims within 30 days after the sale for what the Federal Government believes to be their fair market value. Taxpayers are fully protected here. Actual payments are subject to appropriations. Any funds not used to compensate California revert to the general fund. In fact, if no payment is made within 10 years, the whole fund reverts back to the Treasury. Most important, this process ends the cloud on Elk Hills' title resulting for the State claims because California can only be paid if it releases its claims to Elk Hills lands.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference agreement. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle will tell you how much this report does for military personnel to improve their lives. Well, I rise to tell you what it does to military personnel.

This conference report violates the rights of women on military bases around the world by forbidding them to exercise their right to have an abortion they pay for themselves.

This conference report discriminates against people who are HIV positive, by forcing the military to discharge HIV positive personnel within 6 months of confirmation of their status. They would be discharged regardless of their competence, or current health.

The Department of Defense objects to this policy, as a loss of valuable man-hours. DOD has its own criteria for medical discharge, and will release these people when they cannot perform their duty any further.

Not only does the bill burden military personnel, it also makes it harder to balance the budget in future years. The \$7.1 billion increase above the President's request is a token down payment on hundreds of billions of dollars down the road.

Here are a few examples:

National missile defense was authorized \$853 million above the President's request for fiscal year 1996. CBO estimates that deployment of one system at one site could cost \$29 billion to complete. Adding an additional five sites would increase the cost by \$19 billion, not including operational and support costs for the program. Deploying this system at a single site is equivalent to 80 percent of the entire Defense research and development authorization for this fiscal year.

The B-2 bomber program received an increase of \$493 million just to keep the production line open, even though the plane has yet to meet many of its mission requirements in flight testing. To actually purchase the planes would cost us \$15 billion if we bought 20 more B-2's at a rate of 3 per year.

We cannot commit to this kind of spending and balance the budget. Vote "no" on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 267, nays 149, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 865]

YEAS—267

Abercrombie	Burr	DeLay
Allard	Burton	Diaz-Balart
Archer	Buyer	Dickey
Armey	Callahan	Doolittle
Bachus	Calvert	Dornan
Baesler	Campbell	Dreier
Baker (CA)	Canady	Duncan
Baker (LA)	Castle	Dunn
Baldacci	Chambliss	Durbin
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Edwards
Barr	Christensen	Ehlers
Barrett (NE)	Chrysler	Ehrlich
Bartlett	Clement	Emerson
Barton	Clinger	English
Bass	Clyburn	Ensign
Bateman	Coble	Everett
Bereuter	Coburn	Ewing
Bevill	Coleman	Fawell
Bilbray	Collins (GA)	Fields (TX)
Bilirakis	Combest	Flanagan
Bishop	Cooley	Foley
Bliley	Costello	Forbes
Boehlert	Cox	Ford
Boehner	Cramer	Fowler
Bonilla	Crane	Fox
Bono	Crapo	Franks (CT)
Boucher	Creameans	Frelinghuysen
Brewster	Cubin	Frisa
Browder	Cunningham	Frost
Brownback	Danner	Funderburk
Bryant (TN)	Davis	Gallagher
Bunn	de la Garza	Gekas
Bunning	Deal	Geren

Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)	Sanford
Gillmor	Linder	Saxton
Gilman	Lipinski	Scarborough
Gonzalez	Livingston	Schaefer
Goodlatte	Longley	Shiff
Goodling	Lucas	Scott
Goss	Manton	Seastrand
Graham	Manzullo	Shadegg
Greenwood	Matsui	Shaw
Hall (OH)	McCollum	Shuster
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Sisisky
Hamilton	McDade	Skeen
Hansen	McHugh	Skelton
Harman	McIntosh	Smith (MI)
Hastert	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Meek	Smith (WA)
Hayes	Metcalf	Solomon
Hayworth	Meyers	Souder
Hefley	Mica	Spence
Heineman	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Herger	Mink	Stenholm
Hilleary	Molinari	Stockman
Hobson	Montgomery	Stump
Hoekstra	Moorhead	Talent
Hoke	Myers	Tanner
Horn	Myrick	Tate
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Houghton	Ney	Taylor (MS)
Hoyer	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
Hunter	Nussle	Tejeda
Hutchinson	Ortiz	Thomas
Hyde	Orton	Thompson
Inglis	Oxley	Thornberry
Istook	Packard	Thornton
Jefferson	Parker	Tiahrt
Johnson (CT)	Pastor	Torkildsen
Johnson, E. B.	Paxon	Torres
Johnson, Sam	Payne (VA)	Trafficant
Jones	Petri	Vucanovich
Kasich	Pickett	Waldholtz
Kelly	Pombo	Walker
Kennedy (RI)	Porter	Walsh
Kennelly	Portman	Wamp
Kim	Poshard	Ward
King	Radanovich	Waters
Kingston	Regula	Watts (OK)
Knollenberg	Richardson	Weldon (FL)
Kolbe	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
LaHood	Roberts	Weller
Largent	Rogers	White
Latham	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
Laughlin	Roth	Wolf
Lazio	Royce	Young (AK)
Leach	Salmon	Zeliff

## NAYS—149

Andrews	Flake	Martini
Barcia	Foglietta	Mascara
Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Becerra	Franks (NJ)	McDermott
Beilenson	Furse	McHale
Bentsen	Ganske	McKinney
Berman	Gejdenson	Meehan
Blute	Gephardt	Menendez
Borski	Gibbons	Miller (CA)
Brown (CA)	Gordon	Minge
Brown (FL)	Green	Moakley
Brown (OH)	Gutknecht	Mollohan
Bryant (TX)	Hefner	Moran
Camp	Hilliard	Morella
Cardin	Hinchev	Murtha
Chabot	Holden	Nadler
Chapman	Jackson (IL)	Neal
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Neumann
Clayton	(TX)	Oberstar
Collins (IL)	Jacobs	Obey
Collins (MI)	Johnson (SD)	Olver
Condit	Johnston	Owens
Conyers	Kanjorski	Pallone
Coyne	Kaptur	Payne (NJ)
DeLauro	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Dellums	Kildee	Peterson (FL)
Deutsch	Kleczka	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Klink	Pomeroy
Dingell	Klug	Rahall
Dixon	LaFalce	Ramstad
Doggett	Lantos	Rangel
Dooley	Levin	Reed
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Rivers
Engel	Lincoln	Roemer
Eshoo	LoBiondo	Rose
Evans	Lofgren	Roukema
Farr	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	Luther	Rush
Fazio	Maloney	Sabo
Fields (LA)	Markey	Sanders
Filner	Martinez	Sawyer

Schroeder	Studds	Waxman
Schumer	Stupak	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Thurman	Wilson
Serrano	Torricelli	Wise
Shays	Upton	Woolsey
Skaggs	Velazquez	Wyden
Shlaughter	Vento	Wynn
Spratt	Volkmer	Yates
Stark	Watt (NC)	Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Lewis (CA)	Quinn
Bonior	Lightfoot	Stokes
DeFazio	McInnis	Towns
Gunderson	Mfume	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Pryce	Young (FL)
Hancock	Quillen	

□ 1434

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. DeFazio against.  
Mr. Lightfoot for, with Mr. Stokes against.  
Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Towns against.

Messrs. FARR, SERRANO, and MOL-LOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. BECERRA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. DURBIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I see my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was going to seek recognition and yield to the majority leader, but he preempted me.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks by apologizing to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. I am sure he knows that it gave me no joy to do so.

Mr. HOYER. It does not give me much salve, Mr. Speaker, but I appreciate the observation.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the last scheduled vote for the day. I am sorry to tell the Members that I cannot

at this time make any definitive announcement with respect to the rest of the day. We have many things under consideration. It is possible that we will have another vote which would be, indeed, an important vote, before the day is over.

It is still our hope that we can find a basis by which we could expeditiously get to that point, to have that vote, and under conditions that the Members might feel comfortable with and be free to depart for their own districts for the weekend. We are working toward that objective, and as soon as we have the alternatives fully examined and brought out, we will come back either to present them or to make another announcement. So if the Members can please allow me to beg their indulgence we will, in just a few minutes, after some cleanup work, take a recess subject to the call of the Chair and try to get this done as quickly as we can.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the initial observation I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are very concerned that we stay in whatever negotiations are necessary to try to overcome this impasse and to accomplish the work that is before us. We are also very concerned, of course, that we give notice to the country and to its workers that they in fact will be working on Monday and that government will be operating on Monday.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not at some point in time today his side intends to offer a CR which will ensure that happening?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are working on different alternatives. Mr. Speaker, as you might guess, we were bitterly disappointed in the offer the President's team made today. We find the President's budget proposal to give us scant little with which to work. We do understand the stress of the circumstance that has been brought about by that meager offering. We do have a fairly good measure of the will of the body on both sides of the issue of the possible continuing resolution. We are trying to sort all that out and see what, if anything, we can present to the body before the day's end.

Mr. Speaker, we simply do not wish to make any definitive action until we are fully satisfied we have fully examined all of the options.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] have what we call a clean continuing resolution. Obviously, that would require unanimous consent. Obviously, neither would be recognized for the purposes of offering that unless there was agreement on both sides, but we on this side would hope that the leadership would seriously consider realizing that there were negotiations that went on some weekends ago when this impasse last occurred on November 13. Whether or not we can get that resolution up—