

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 24, 1994

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mrs. LLOYD].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 24, 1994.

I hereby designate the Honorable MARILYN LLOYD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, February 11, 1994, and Monday, May 23, 1994, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority and minority leaders, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

ADMINISTRATION FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, it is 16 months since the Clinton administration came into office. When President Clinton received the mantle of leadership from President Bush, the world was a far different place than when President Bush had assumed the Presidency 4 years earlier.

When Mr. Clinton took the oath of office, the threat of nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, after hanging over the entire world for two generations, was gone—as was the Soviet Union.

The Berlin Wall, a symbol of Soviet communism for more than 30 years, was a pile of rubble. The United Nations, freed from the frozen confines of the cold war, was being used for humanitarian purposes.

The United States had proven itself as a leader and reliable partner in world affairs, as was seen in the coalition we built to fight the Persian Gulf war. Nations emerging from years of totalitarian darkness in the cold war were seeking—with our help—to translate our ideals into action.

After 16 months into the Clinton administration it is time to ask: Where in the world do we stand? Seeking that answer has many shaking their heads in wonderment. Let us examine the record:

The high hopes of the United Nations as a force for humanitarian purposes founded in the deserts of Somali on the rocks of nationbuilding and a posse hunted down a war lord.

In peacekeeping, the United Nation's credibility is under strain. The use of American dollars appears to sustain operations that provide little return for high cost.

A confused command structure has held the United Nations up to ridicule as it struggles to define and implement policy.

In world capitals, our Nation is being challenged by adversaries and allies alike. Many are questioning whether Mr. Clinton has the sense of purpose of his predecessors.

During the Reagan-Bush years, the United States sought to define U.S. foreign policy in lines that were clear and bright so that allies and adversaries would know just where we stood on the issues.

We succeeded largely because we understood that, to succeed, our foreign policy required bipartisan support.

The Clinton administration contends that it seeks a bipartisan foreign policy—and we would welcome a bipartisan foreign policy. But bipartisanship is a two-way street.

This administration's brand of bipartisanship asks Republicans not how to help chart the course but to cushion the crash landings of its foreign policy initiatives.

In his candidacy, President Clinton promised to "focus like a laser on the economy." The implication of that statement was that foreign policy did not require the same kind of concentrated thinking which he planned to devote to domestic issues.

But, just as we observe on such issues as the trade status of China, export controls over dual-use technology, and other such concerns, foreign policy and economic policy become inseparably interwoven.

Regrettably, the administration's approach to foreign policy looks and sounds more like a pinball machine—all flashing lights and buzzers, not knowing where the ball is going to land.

Headlines in the news media tell the story: From the Chicago Tribune of May 18—"U.S. Steps Back From U.N.

Mission in Rwanda"; from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 19—"White House Weighs Face-Saving Measures on Chinese Trade"; from yesterday's Washington Post—"Clinton's Solution on Chinese Trade May Be Problem."

An editorial in the Baltimore Sun of May 17 described the administration's latest peace initiative in Bosnia as "an American retreat from untenable policy positions."

The respect and regard with which our Nation is held in the world cannot long withstand the repeated effects of such a disjointed approach to foreign policy.

We must not squander our Nation's resolve and determination which has been built up over the years, and our support for the democratic ideals for which our Nation stands.

It is time for the administration to take up the mantle of world leadership that it sought, received, and with which it was invested 16 months ago.

ACCOMPLISHING SOMETHING POSITIVE IN HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, like many Haitians, administration foreign policy is adrift in a leaky boat. It's not the what, it's the how. We agree that the goal in Haiti is to restore democracy, but how can we accomplish that goal? For the fifth time since the 1991 coup that ousted Haiti's popularly elected President, Jean Bertrande Aristide, the United States this weekend escalated punishing economic sanctions against Haiti. Aimed at the military regime, the latest round of stronger sanctions are proving to be just as off-target as their predecessors. They are further demoralizing and impoverishing Haiti's poor, who are again building leaky boats and taking to the seas. Even United States activist Randall Robinson, who has already had a clear impact on the President's policy toward Haiti, now insists sanctions will not work. Yesterday, Mr. Robinson, said, "Because the sanctions will not work we have no choice but to pursue ultimately a solution of military intervention." If the sanctions are not hitting the military, what are they doing? American businessmen who have weathered many political storms to continue providing jobs and productivity in Haiti, are finally having to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

fold up shop. One Florida businessman from my district closed his operation this weekend and took with him the livelihood of 180 Haitians. "This is the hardest thing I've ever done" he said, "There's no welfare here. When these people walk out on the street, they have nothing." In a country where more than 75 percent of the population lives in abject poverty one paycheck often supports an extended family of 10.

The administration may be pleased with a Dominican Republic pledge for stronger enforcement of the embargo, but even Randall Robinson knows that the end result will be tougher times for the Haitian people while the military finds the loopholes—and there will inevitably be loopholes.

There is a better solution to a misdirected embargo and military invasion of Haiti. For the last 18 months I have offered a plan for a safe haven on Haitian soil—such as the Ile de la Gonave—under the auspices of the OAS and the United Nations. Under this plan, day-to-day economic, political, internal security, and other decisions would be Haitian responsibilities. External security would be provided to the island by one Coast Guard cutter passing periodically through the channel between the island and the Haitian mainland, it is already there. We know 88,000 people already live on this 269-square-mile island, and it is virtually free of military shenanigans. We also know the Haitian military has neither the interest nor the ability to overrun it.

The return of the democratically elected government to Haitian soil would provide the morale boost so desperately needed by the beleaguered Haitian people.

In addition, the safe haven would be the ideal place to provide support services and humanitarian relief for refugees leaving the mainland. The immigration magnet would be shifted away from United States shores, to a Haitian island 16 miles across the Gulf of Gonave. Rather than pounding the poorest country in our hemisphere with more economic punishment, the safe haven would pave the way for long-term democracy and economic stability.

This is not a new idea. The United Nations High Commission on Refugees used a similar approach in Sri Lanka in the early 1990's with its open refugee center program on Mannar Island.

While there were some difficulties in providing for the external security of these centers, that problem is easily solved on island haven of Gonave. Today, Members have the chance to vote for this type of positive proposal, which avoids United States military invasion, provides for an immediate lifting of the misery embargo, offers safe haven and hope to Haitian refugees and actually accomplishes something for democracy in Haiti.

Don't be fooled—the Dellums-Hamilton amendment approach, for all its four pages of nice words, does not solve the problem for Haiti. We are gratified that it now seems to include strong language against military intervention. However, apparently this is still a moving target and may be further updated. Vote for the Goss safe haven amendment.

□ 1040

INTRODUCTION OF THE LAUNCH SERVICES CORPORATION ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LLOYD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, today I would like to talk about a subject that has bothered me since I came to Congress in 1987, and that is the steady erosion of America's eminence in space, and particularly the space launch industry.

When I came to Congress, we had just lost the *Challenger* in 1986, and for all practical purposes, we were out of space for 2 years because we simply could not get things together to get back into our space program.

In space, money matters. It costs about \$9,000 to launch a pound into orbit aboard Europe's Ariane, the world's most successful commercial rocket. This figure outstrips our Titan III. Our Atlas and our Delta are competitive for now. Next year's launch of an improved Ariane could leave only Delta as a competitive rocket. Even these figures do not take into account entry into the commercial market of nonmarket economies such as China and Russia.

These two are pursuing a pricing trend which may stabilize at \$4,000 a pound, half of what anyone else charges.

All of this has resulted in the loss of 70 percent of the world commercial launch market over the past few years. We used to have 100 percent. We have lost about 70 percent. We now have about 30 percent.

How have we reacted to this? We have tried diplomacy. We tried to limit the number of commercial satellites China and Russia can make. We have made incremental improvements to our existing fleet. We have spent about \$2 billion and \$3 billion over the last 6 years studying ways of making launches cheaper.

Where is the action? The American launch industry is insulated from the market pressures other businesses face. The Federal Government is overwhelmingly the biggest customer of the U.S. space-launch industry.

Commercial space, in contrast, is inelastic with a small profit margin.

Thus industry has little incentive to lower cost. Until recently, a few in the launch industry were unwilling to admit there was even a problem.

Industry initiative has atrophied over 40 years of cold war command-and-control programs. Most companies today believe all of this could be solved if a lead agency was named and enough government money was provided.

Government has no money for such investments. Thus, we continue to tinker with what we built for 40 years. We continue to build race cars instead of trucks, and we base it on old ballistic missiles.

The solution, competing in today's world market, means controlling it. Controlling that market requires lowering launch costs to a level that can compete with Russian and French carriers even without trade restrictions.

Only an entity responsive to market pressures has the initiative to meet such a standard.

With these reasons in mind, I am introducing the Launch Services Corporation Act of 1994, based on the highly successful Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

The President would be directed to issue a set of national requirements for space launch and then bring about a corporation to raise private capital and provide launching services. To support this effort, the Government would negotiate a guaranteed number of launches, provide some money to cover nonrecurring costs, provide access to launch facilities, and help with research and development.

The arrangement in my bill is similar to what the Government did for the fledgling aviation and airline industries earlier in this century.

After 6 years the Government would get out and the corporation would have to make it on its own as a private for-profit corporation. Admittedly, this bill carries some risks, but these are things that should and must be debated.

This bill is my attempt to get this 30-year debate off the dime. Clearly, we cannot go on the way we have been.

I believe that, unless we take steps to revitalize our launch industry, those companies which helped us win the cold war may wind up as the last casualties of that war.

WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE EXPLOITED IN CHINA AS PRESIDENT CLINTON CODDLES THEIR OPPRESSORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, for the last year and a half one foreign affairs crisis after another has burst onto the world stage, and

this administration always seems to be unprepared, indecisive, and sadly lacking principle.

This morning I want to highlight but one example of how Mr. Clinton's foreign policy is in disarray. Mr. Clinton arrived in Washington 16 months ago, and his penchant for obfuscation and indecision is causing people around the globe to question and to lose faith in the ability of the United States to stand firm for what is right, for what is honorable and true, to fight even for our own national interests and to base decisions on a consistent human rights agenda.

United States relations with China is but one example. Mr. Clinton has failed, in my view, to even hold to his own words regarding respect for human rights.

The White House has become a Tower of Babel, and as we look back over the past year, we saw many voices speaking, sometimes pro-human rights linkage, sometimes against it. At other times they only emphasized certain human rights, diminishing the others. When you take it all together, the White House has been a virtual Tower of Babel speaking with so many tongues.

This is also true in the area of the population control program in the People's Republic of China, one of the most heinous crimes being committed against women today, crimes of gender, crimes against women, the exploitation of women, and yet this administration has not only been silent, paying only lip service to it, but its actions have spoken much louder in the opposite direction.

Madam Speaker, each year population control fanatics in China forcibly abort about 10 million children, and that is each year, out of approximately 13 million annual Chinese abortions. That is as many children per year as the combined totals of the entire populations of Nicaragua and El Salvador.

Forced abortion, properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg war crimes trials, is today employed with chilling effectiveness and unbearable pain, especially against women. Women in China are required to obtain a birth coupon, because conceiving a child is out of bounds if she is not given permission by the Government.

The New York Times pointed out in its April 25, 1993 exposé that when the Chinese authorities discover an unauthorized pregnancy, in other words, an illegal pregnancy, they normally apply a daily dose of threats and browbeating. Those who resist are often assessed massive fines, and many times, this is many times, their per-capita income.

Peasants in many provinces say their homes are routinely knocked down if the fines are not paid, the Times reported.

Clearly the population gestapo and their use of coercion wears down many women. They finally give up, because they cannot fight back. They know they cannot win. And yet this administration has not stood by those women.

In December 1993, the Chinese Government also issued a draft eugenics law which would nationalize discrimination against the handicapped, much of which is already in effect at the provincial level. Taking a page right out of Nazi Germany, the Chinese Government is aggressively implementing forced abortion against handicapped children simply because they may be suffering from some anomaly like Down's syndrome.

When the rest of the world moves to protect the rights and dignity of handicapped persons, China is seeking ways to exterminate them. Sadly, again, the Clinton administration has turned its back on this massive exploitation of women and of children.

Syndicated columnist Bob Novak in yesterday's Washington Post provided a very, very distressing insight into this daily occurrence. He points out:

On April 25, Alan Lin, a Chinese immigrant working for a bank in Concord, California, called Senator Dianne Feinstein's office pleading for help. His 5-months-pregnant wife in China faced abortion demanded by the Communist authorities. Could the Senator prod the INS to grant a visa?

As the story goes on to say, and I urge Members to read this, it goes on to say that he, on behalf of his wife, was met with deaf ears on behalf of or by the Senator from California and also, sadly to say, by the administration.

Madam Speaker, I am including that newspaper article at this point in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 1994]

FORCED ABORTION IN CHINA

(By Robert D. Novak)

On April 28, Alan Wanrong Lin, a Chinese immigrant working for a bank in Concord, Calif., called the San Francisco office of Sen. Dianne Feinstein pleading for help. His five-months pregnant wife in China faced an abortion demanded by Communist authorities. Could the senator prod the Immigration and Naturalization Service bureaucrats to grant Mrs. Lin a visa to enter the United States?

According to a memo Lin typed at 8 o'clock the next morning, David Swerdlick, the Democratic senator's case officer, "told me not to waste time." The aide was quoted as saying: "The senator is not interested in the birth-control policies in another country."

Lin said Swerdlick wanted him to "give up," adding: "He makes me feel that I am fighting against the senator and the president, but I only want to fight the inhuman Chinese government." Fearing the Chinese would order a "delayed abortion to kill my wife," he told her to succumb. The baby was aborted that day, April 29.

This abortion, one of millions forced by China's draconian birth-control policy, shows what happens in official U.S. circles when human rights and abortion rights col-

lide. The administration and its congressional allies threaten to sever trading relations with China if it does not treat its citizens more kindly, but they flinch from an antiabortion posture.

It is a dilemma for well-intended liberals such as Feinstein: how to press China for a more humane treatment of its citizens while maintaining noninterference with abortion policies around the world.

Feinstein on Feb. 1 voted to continue pressing for human-rights progress in China. "Some would say," she said, "that human rights are a matter of a country's internal affairs. However, I believe we are our brother's keepers."

But Feinstein has introduced a bill to repeal Section 4 of President Bush's Executive Order No. 12711, of Jan. 29, 1990. She proposed ending "enhanced consideration" for immigration of persons fleeing a country because of "forced abortion or coerced sterilization." Actually, under President Clinton, Bush's mandate has not been complied with—as Lin soon found out.

His wife is 22 years old—one year too young to suit Fujian Province requirements for a "birth license." To avoid a forced abortion, she went into hiding in Fuzhou City while awaiting a U.S. visa—a process that will take at least another year. To escape Chinese birth-control police, the Lins asked for her immediate entry on a "humanitarian parole."

On April 4, 15 Democratic and 37 Republican congressmen wrote Attorney General Janet Reno pleading for help. GOP Rep. Christopher Smith tried repeatedly to get the attorney general on the telephone.

On April 25, the INS district director in Bangkok denied the Lins' request on grounds it was not based on "emergency conditions."

After I noted on television May 7 the Feinstein office's treatment of the Lins, the senator expressed shock. Her case worker denied to his superior the words attributed to him by Lin.

On May 10 Feinstein wrote Lin regretting that "my staff did not bring your plea to my attention" and added this postscript in her own hand: "I am so sorry!"

On May 11, she wrote Secretary of State Warren Christopher, Reno and INS Commissioner Doris Meissner. Calling the abortion a "personal tragedy," Feinstein said: "The suffering they have endured will never be erased, but the United States can still act now to bring them together immediately."

U.S. authorities blame the Lins for their own misery.

"We did not believe that this would have been required by the Fuzhou City government authorities," Assistant Attorney General Sheila F. Anthony argued. "We regret that Mr. and Mrs. Lin determined that she should undergo the abortion."

But Steven W. Mosher, an authority on Chinese birth-control methods, denies U.S. government arguments that no abortion would have been forced. He contends that "coercion is not limited to a handful of offending provinces or officials but is found throughout China." Feinstein's letter to Lin noted that "your wife underwent surgery to terminate her pregnancy as ordered by the Chinese government."

"I still feel that there are still a lot of nice and humanitarian people," Lin wrote, "*** even though [they are] weaker than the evil power." What is hard for him to understand is how the officials of his new country could tolerate the evil.

□ 1050

I tried repeatedly to get Attorney General Janet Reno on the phone to

ask, to plead that this poor woman with a 5-month-old baby in her womb, that she be given a humanitarian parole. She was already approved for a visa. Already approved. It was a matter of expediting the timetable. She was turned down. This administration could not care less.

Madam Speaker, there are many, many examples of how this administration has turned its back on Chinese women. The Justice Department has suppressed a Bush administration regulation that would have provided enhanced consideration for others seeking asylum. It has doubled the amount of money, provided \$100 million to the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA], an organization that has a hand-in-glove relationship with the Chinese Government.

I suggest that my colleagues ask themselves the following question: If you were a Chinese leader witnessing these actions, would you take the administration's professed concern about human rights in China seriously?

The continued coercive measures used to enforce the population control program and the eugenics policy, which scholars from the United States Holocaust Museum have likened to Nazi-era programs and which would target the most vulnerable members of Chinese society, have failed to arouse any meaningful response from the Clinton administration. Sure, the Secretary of State has said that he is appalled by news reports of these atrocities but lip-service is not enough. I truly believe that it is fair to ask whether President Clinton is genuinely concerned about the rampant practices of forced and eugenic abortion in China.

None of us can close our eyes to, squint, or in any way downplay or overlook the abysmal human rights record of the People's Republic of China. Let us be candid, China has been and remains a dictatorship—its leaders routinely and cruelly violate the rights of its citizens and the trend is ominously moving in precisely the wrong direction. The United States Department of State in the annual Country Report on Human Rights Practices says that China's "overall human rights record in 1993 fell far short of internationally accepted norms"—not just short, far short.

In the face of this ongoing repression, the Chinese Government is getting mixed signals from the Clinton administration regarding its seriousness about human rights. We are certainly not getting a mixed message from the People's Republic of China. The human rights record of that country has continued to decline in the past year. Not only that, the Chinese Government has chosen times and opportunities to show their contempt for United States commitment to human rights which have been most embarrassing.

Madam Speaker, during my visit to China in January I attended a Mass

celebrated by Bishop Su Zhi Ming. Bishop Su has spent 15 years in Chinese prisons and suffers physical disability because of the beatings, torture, and mistreatment at the hands of security police. Shortly after our visit, on January 20, the very day that Secretary Bentsen was in China discussing the future of United States-Sino relations, Bishop Su was arrested and detained for 9 days. He was interrogated at length about his meeting with us. His crime—leading a worship service for foreigners.

Bishop Pei was also to say Mass for our delegation. We were told that he had to go for an emergency anointing of the sick. I have recently found out that the person who came to get him was actually a security officer who took Bishop Pei to the police offices so that he could not say Mass for our delegation.

Another Catholic priest, Father Wei Jingyi, was also arrested on January 20. His whereabouts are unknown. Even now, the authorities deny he is being detained, although they have accepted clothing for him from his sister. According to information I received, it is believed that he is being held because of his position in the underground Catholic Church and that the Government is trying to obtain information from him.

New religious laws which further restrict the religious activity of foreigners and Chinese were issued on January 28. These laws outlaw activities even done in the privacy of one's home and give the green light to security policy to arrest, imprison, and torture religious believers. The police have already moved to enforce these laws. One victim has been Rev. Dennis Balcombe, an American citizen, who was detained for 4 days, unable to contact the U.S. Embassy. Before he was finally deported, all of his belongings were confiscated.

All religious believers in China are asking for is the ability to worship freely and openly. Right now those who do not belong to the government-sponsored churches have no place to worship, many of them are denied housing and work permits, and countless numbers are harassed, detained, tortured—and some have been martyred for their faith.

The U.S. Government needs to speak out clearly, consistently and unequivocally about these deplorable abuses of fundamental human rights. In addition, we need to take action which conveys our seriousness about these issues. The constant vacillation by the Clinton administration—not only toward China but throughout the world—severely undermines our ability to bring about improvements in these tragic human rights conditions.

Madam Speaker, this administration has failed to create a coherent foreign policy. The President's decisionmaking

process results in confusion—confusion among U.S. policymakers, confusion among our allies, and the exploitation of that confusion by our adversaries. When foreign policy is in such disarray, people throughout the world lose. Most serious of all, Madam Speaker, the American people lose.

DISCHARGE PETITION FOR REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LLOYD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to sign Discharge Petition No. 19, which would discharge an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 830, the Regulatory Flexibility Amendments Act of 1993. This bill has over 250 cosponsors.

The Regulatory Flexibility Act was passed by Congress and signed by President Carter back in 1980. In passing the RFA, Congress recognized that Federal regulations have a disproportionate impact on small businesses and small governmental entities and that Federal regulations ought to be written flexibly, to take this impact into consideration.

The RFA requires regulators to prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis for any new regulation which will have a significant impact on small entities and to find ways to minimize those effects. The RFA requires regulators to find the least costly way to implement regulations.

Because judicial review of agency compliance with the RFA is prohibited, there is no recourse against Federal bureaucrats who ignore the RFA. Most Federal agencies routinely ignore the RFA by passing boilerplate exemptions from the act. Without judicial review, these determinations cannot be challenged. In short, the regulators are judge, juror, and executioner.

H.R. 830 would put some much-needed teeth into the RFA by allowing judicial review, and would otherwise strengthen the act.

H.R. 830 is strongly supported by the small business community. A coalition of nearly 50 small business groups has come together to urge Congress to pass this legislation. This coalition includes the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Roofing Contractors, the National Association for the Self Employed, and the National Federation of Independent Business.

Vice President GORE's National Performance Review studied the RFA, and concluded that judicial review is necessary to force regulators to start complying. In fact, judicial review of the RFA was their No. 1 recommendation for the Small Business Administration.

Why has this bill not moved? Because the bureaucrats oppose it. No greater special interest frustrates small businesses more or makes them madder than the biggest special interest group in Washington, DC—the bureaucracy. We created it. It is the tail that wags the dog. Let us help put a stop to that now by signing Discharge Petition No. 19.

I would like to thank each of the 251 cosponsors of H.R. 830 for their help in bringing this issue to the attention of Congress. The bill has received widespread bipartisan support, including both the chairman and ranking member of the Small Business Committee. We have worked to bring H.R. 830 through the regular legislative process. However, the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the bill has given no indication that he will mark up this legislation before Congress adjourns this fall.

Madam Speaker, when a bill has over 250 cosponsors, which is well over half the House, it would seem fair that the bill should at least be debated and voted on by the full House.

Once again, I encourage my colleagues to sign Discharge Petition No. 19, which will bring forward an open rule for consideration of H.R. 830.

WE NEED AN IMPROVED FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express some of my concerns about the state of our foreign policy. In recent weeks we have seen a gathering crisis of confidence emerge in regard to the President's handling of foreign policy. Polls show that only 13 percent of the American public believes that the President has a coherent foreign policy. I take no pleasure in these facts. But who can dispute them?

The revolution in communications brings frightful sights to our screens—murdered American soldiers being dragged through the streets of Somalia; Haitian thugs turning away the United States Navy; strutting dictators and their nuclear swagger, and even at home, our World Trade Towers smoldering—these things are very real and very unsettling. From this Chamber to "Nightline," the question of foreign policy is beginning to vex so many Americans are beginning to feel uncomfortable.

They are beginning to sense that all of this turbulence might just mean there is no pilot up front. Senior-most members of the President's own party, in both Houses, have joined commentators, analysts, and statesmen around the world in expressions of apprehension and incredulity. This week's Time

magazine asks if its time for Warren Christopher to say goodbye; but I say that the President of the United States is supposed to be the pilot, and sacrificing a navigator is not going to solve the problem.

Goals, when articulated, seem to lapse into excuses and rationalizations. Human rights, nonproliferation, and democracy are posited, and China, North Korea, and Haiti result. A commitment is made to preserving America's hard earned role as a force for good in the world, and then Bosnia belies the lack of resolve and underscores the absence of vision. The use of force is hinted at, or expressly threatened, and then withdrawn as if it were a campaign ad.

When the parameters that will define our security for the next century are in such uncertain focus, there are those who would rush to severely constrain our defense and intelligence capacities. We must not fall into the trap of having a crisis of credibility compounded by a crisis in capability.

Speaking of crises, I want to speak for just a moment about the nuclear issue. The administrator says, and rightly so, that nuclear proliferation is the greatest threat to U.S. security and global stability. They claim a goal of a global ban on fissile-material production, yet they have sought to skirt the only piece of nonproliferation legislation we have on the books.

The administration has vacillated on North Korea's nuclear threat while that threat continues to grow. First, the President says a North Korean bomb will not be tolerated, then within weeks the CIA says there are probably two, and possibly more, bombs in hand or in the works. The President's response to North Korea's nuclear shell game is to cancel our joint exercises with the South, send Patriot defense batteries by the slow boat, and tell us to pray for our 37,000 troops.

□ 1100

Now the news comes this past weekend that North Korea has purchased 40 nuclear-missile-capable submarines from the former Soviet Union. You can bet they did not arrive by slow boat. Kim Il-sung has listened to our threats, measured our resolve, and shrugged. The crisis on the Korean Peninsula is real; it will not go away with a gentleman's passing grade from the IAEA. Kim Il-sung will continue to build, and sell, his weapons, including his ballistic missiles to all takers. He will continue to threaten the region, and this threat can be expected to impel others in the region unfortunately to enhance their forces as well.

The administration rightly asserts that the number one nuclear threat in the world—what it calls the principal threat to United States national security—is the former Soviet Union. That is why it is so troubling to me that the

\$800 million of Nunn-Lugar funds for the dismantling of that threat remains largely unspent. This means that the dismantling of the world's largest nuclear arsenal, in Russia and the three other nuclear States of the former Soviet Union, though agreed to during the last administration, remains a distant task under this administration. Moreover, the \$12 billion buydown of the former Soviet Union States' fissile-materials supply will last well in to the next century. In the meantime, Russia is supplying submarines to North Korea, and may, according to administration officials, supply Iran and other terrorist states with the nuclear reactor technology and materiel they are so desperately seeking.

Madam Speaker, I see a troubling pattern emerging—a pattern which sends a signal to the Saddam Husseins, Kim Il-songs, and Slobodan Milosevics—and to all those like them waiting patiently in the wings around the world, a signal that the United States will not stand in their way, and will not take their measure until it is too late and too costly. The United States cannot afford to send this signal. Fledgling democracies around the world remain fragile and cannot suffer our lack of focus distraction; the Middle East peace process is in its infancy and cannot be stillborn from our indifference; in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, new transitions to markets are being tested and cannot afford to fall victim to regional instability or shifting alliances. In Russia and China, military apparatus and their followers need to know that their old systems cannot be fixed, and that pluralism and peace are the path forward.

So much has been brought to the fore with the end of the cold war and the opportunities are great. The corollary of course, is that so much is at risk. Sustained leadership attention is critical; episodic attention will not suffice. Foreign policy leadership is not a Presidential option; it is a high duty.

We have an obligation to keep faith with those people who placed their faith in us during the cold war and its struggles. By the same token, we have a duty to maintain and strengthen the institutional arrangements and alliances which served the peace longer than any others in modern memory. We should not hasten into new arrangements for the sake of some imagined order. We do not need redefinition; we need resolve. We do not need a policy guided by polls and hunger strikes; We do not need global town meetings. We need a policy rooted in principle and underpinned by strength. We need a policy that clearly sets forth what we view as the acceptable rules of international behavior in the post-cold-war era and what price we attach to their violation.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LLOYD). There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mrs. LLOYD] at 12 noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, prompt us to offer gratefulness and praise for the gifts of this day. May the rich association between friends and colleagues enlighten our tasks; may the awareness of splendor and beauty in the world increase our joy; may our perception of new ideas for difficult problems encourage and inspire us, and may Your message of reconciliation and compassion between peoples lead us in the paths of peace. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this vote are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GILLMOR led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title.

H.R. 4277. An act to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency and to make other improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4277) "An Act to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency and to make other improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BREAU, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. DOLE, to the conferees on the part of the Senate.

VOTE "NO" ON THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

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

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, communism is dead, and the cold war is over. The major enemy that we face today, the major threat to our national security, is not the Soviet Union, not China, not North Vietnam. The major crisis that our country is facing is the declining standard of living of our workers, 22 percent of our children who live in poverty, the millions of elderly who are struggling to stay alive on meager Social Security payments.

Madam Speaker, I will vote against the Department of Defense authorization because we have got our priorities all wrong and because we do not need to spend \$250 billion a year on defense. We do not need more research and development on nuclear weapons, we do not need more money for ballistic missile defense, and we do not need to spend \$100 billion a year defending Europe and Asia against a nonexistent enemy.

Madam Speaker, let us get our priorities right; let us vote for our workers, our children, and the elderly.

Please vote "no" on the defense budget.

THE INDEPENDENT COUNSEL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, did you know that the independent counsel conference committee is going to meet again?

Apparently, the Democrats who control this Congress have finally found a compelling reason to pass the independent counsel legislation to help President Clinton pay his legal fees in the Whitewater affair.

Here is how it works: By giving Robert Fiske the title "independent counsel" rather than "special prosecutor," the Democrats have discovered that they will be able to stick the American people with Mr. and Mrs. Clinton's legal bills. Since the President has so many legal problems these days, this inspired them to get moving again on the independent counsel conference.

Is it not amazing how greed can motivate what a simple, sincere desire for good government apparently cannot?

So, colleagues, you may wish to think twice about the ramifications of this independent counsel conference, because American taxpayers should not be stuck with the President's legal fees.

ON PREVENTING TERRORISM IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, last year four terrorists bombed the World Trade Center, 6 Americans were killed, over 1,000 Americans were wounded. News reports today are now breaking saying that these four terrorists will get life imprisonment without parole, life imprisonment without parole.

Tell me, America, who is being punished? These four creeps, or the Americans taxpayers who will pay \$50,000 per criminal in prison per year—\$200,000 a year to keep these creeps alive?

I think it is time, Congress, to stretch their necks. And I believe, further, that Phil Donahue should be allowed to broadcast it overseas so that every terrorist could see that if you kill an American citizen, Congress is going to stretch your neck. They have had it.

Think about it.

FOREIGN POLICY IS FOREIGN CONCEPT TO ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, is foreign policy a foreign concept to the administration? This week's Time magazine includes a quote from an unnamed White House staffer who

gushed the following about the administration's policy toward Haiti: "The policy wasn't working, and we realized, hey, we're the White House; we can change it." This fickle and sophomoric attitude illustrates the current confusion in Washington over the lack of a coherent White House foreign policy.

The President and his top foreign policy advisers cannot seem to keep the car on the road. On one hand, we have the lack of direction in Bosnia and Haiti, and on the other the apparent indecision on whether to recommend most-favored-nation trading status to China.

In my view the Clinton administration's foreign policy is functioning like a ship without a rudder—it lacks the focus, the ability to stay the course and the unified voice necessary to provide the world a clear and concise understanding of our Nation's priorities.

Former Secretary of State James Baker perhaps hit the nail on the head when he described the Clinton administration as "uncomfortable with the concept of American power" and said its foreign policy was damaging U.S. credibility in the world.

The world today is in a changing revolutionary state, demanding extraordinary leadership from the United States. And as a nation, Madam Speaker, we cannot tolerate amateur foreign policy—the stakes are too high.

THE TRIAD

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, we must never forget the link between our military, our foreign policy, and our intelligence network.

A strong military, a coherent foreign policy, and an effective intelligence network work together to keep our country out of danger and in peace.

The Clinton record with this triad is alarming. By slashing military spending, the President threatens to recreate Jimmy Carter's hollow force.

By failing to define a strong foreign policy, the President sows confusion among our neighbors and promotes opportunism with our enemies.

By cutting spending in our intelligence networks, the President bases his decisions on faulty data and incorrect assumptions.

From Bosnia to North Korea, from Haiti to Rwanda, the Clinton record in international affairs continues to concern the American people. I urge the President to improve our national security triad and keep the United States in peace.

LOGAN'S RUN REVISITED

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

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, there once was a science fiction movie named "Logan's Run." The premise of the movie was that once a person reached the age of 30, that person was exterminated.

You have to wonder what the Clinton administration's goal might be.

It won't support the repeal of the earnings test limit on senior citizens.

It proposes a plan to make seniors pay more for social security.

And now, apparently, it would have the health care system pay less to fight diseases that kill older Americans.

Listen to these words of Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders, in justifying what the administration's priorities are:

Most of the people that die with heart disease and cancer are our elderly population, you know, and we all will probably die with something sooner or later.

Madam Speaker, older Americans have a vital contribution to make to our society. We should not make them the victims of big expensive government.

□ 1210

URGING FRESHMAN DEMOCRATS TO FULFILL THEIR CAMPAIGN PLEDGE

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Speaker, it is time for change. The American people want real accountability from their Members of Congress. The American people want real votes on real spending cuts. The American people want the A to Z spending cuts plan.

I urge all of my colleagues to sign Discharge Petition No. 16 to force a vote on the A to Z plan. But I particularly want to reach out to my friends who were elected in 1992 for the first time.

All 44 freshmen Republicans have signed the A to Z discharge petition. Even this body's newest Member—our friend from Oklahoma—has signed this petition.

We now must turn to the freshmen Democrats for support, and I say to them:

You are the new blood, the new direction for this Congress. In 1992, you told the voters you stand for fiscal responsibility and congressional accountability. You stood against business as usual. You stood for change. A to Z is your best chance to fulfill that campaign pledge. Twenty three freshmen Democrats have cosponsored this strong bipartisan effort to cut spending. I urge you to follow through on your earlier commitment to real votes on real spending cuts by signing the discharge petition.

Currently we have 229 Members who have signed the legislation, and 172 Members have signed the discharge petition.

As a group these 23 freshmen Democrats can make a big difference by joining the 172 Members and making it 195 Members who are committed to cutting spending and changing the way we do business.

SIGN THE A TO Z DISCHARGE PETITION

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, it should come as no surprise to anyone in this institution that the American people are discouraged and frustrated with Congress. Call it gridlock, call it political partisanship, call it what you will. The fact remains that Congress is not doing what the American people has asked us to do, which is cut spending and live within our means.

The leadership in Congress and the administration passed a so-called deficit reduction bill last year that will leave us \$1 trillion deeper in debt 5 years from now than we are today. It is more of the same. It is business as usual. Tax and spend again and again, and let our children and grandchildren pay the tab.

There is an alternative. We can show the American people that we care about their future by signing the A to Z discharge petition.

Let us put partisanship aside. No one disagrees with the need to cut spending and live within our means. The American people deserve fiscal responsibility from their elected representatives. We were sent here to make a difference, not to perpetuate the status quo. Support A to Z.

EMPLOYER MANDATE BLOCKING RESOLUTION OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, one of the big issues that has blocked the resolution of health care in this body up to this point is whether or not we have an employer mandate. An employer mandate really is onerous on those businesses, those small businesses, mom and pop businesses, businesses usually under five employees. It is not that those companies do not want to buy health care, but they cannot afford it when they go to the market and it costs 5 or \$6,000 per employee to buy that type of insurance. But in some health care bills that are coming before this Congress they are mandated to do it. In essence we are saying, "Either you buy insurance and lose your job, or you have insurance and you don't have a job." What we are saying is there ought to be a vote on this floor, whatever health care bill

comes to town, to do away with the employer mandate.

Madam Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "You can help that happen on a bipartisan basis. Sign on to House Resolution 242 to ask for a vote on this floor on whether or not we have an employer mandate."

AMERICAN HEARTLAND CALLING OUT FOR OPEN DEBATE ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this past weekend this Member held listening sessions in Lincoln, Fremont, Norfolk, and Beatrice, NE, the largest cities in the First Congressional District. These Americans from the heartland of our country are very interested and concerned about health care reform legislation now pending in the Congress. They shared their concerns with me in great detail and with strong emphasis. The more than 8,000 people who responded to the questionnaire I circulated last March rejected the Clinton health care plan by 61.6 percent to 13.8 percent, 24.6 percent undecided.

Most importantly, the 540,000 Nebraskans I represent expect and demand that this Member of Congress, like the other 434 elected Representatives, will have a role in debating and voting upon the elements and detailed alternatives to the health care reform proposal that eventually reaches the House floor. They will be watching with intense interest to see if democracy is really allowed to work here on the floor of the House of Representatives or whether partisan considerations will once again drive the Democrat leadership to shut off a range of legitimate amendments and ram the health care legislation through the House. The public wants all Members of Congress to have an opportunity to work their will on the committees' product and then they want to be able to hold each Member responsible for their votes.

Madam Speaker, no closed or semi-closed rules, no backroom deals among the congressional barons or majority leadership, and no partisan freezeouts. This issue is too important to all Americans. Let democracy work in the U.S. House too.

MEDICAL TREATMENT AND HONEST ANSWERS SOUGHT BY PERSIAN GULF WAR VETERANS

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

Mr. SWETT. Madam Speaker, this week, as we focus on the defense of our Nation, I urge my colleagues to join me in recommitting ourselves to the well-

being of each and every soldier, sailor, and airman who has served in our military.

I am particularly concerned with the treatment of those individuals who fought and won the Persian Gulf war—individuals who, when called upon by their Nation, responded with honor and dignity.

Madam Speaker, many of these soldiers who answered their Nation's call and gallantly drove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait paid a heavy price—some with their lives and many more with their health. Those who continue to suffer are now calling upon us to serve them in their time of need. The vast array of symptoms and ailments related to their service in the gulf must not be dismissed or ignored. Questions of blame and cause must not be allowed to blur the reality of soldiers in need. We must ensure that full medical treatment and honest answers are provided to these individuals immediately.

Madam Speaker, this week, as we discuss our numerous defense policies and programs, let us remember that behind each of these stands the individual soldier, ready to answer the call and expecting the same in return.

WHITEWATER HEARINGS NOW

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker, for the past 2 months, the majority leadership has asked the minority to hold off pressing for Whitewater hearings, and allow Special Prosecutor Robert Fiske a free hand.

Yet only last week, Mr. Fiske acknowledged that he felt congressional hearings would not be inappropriate at this time.

So, what are we waiting for? Today, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], will introduce a resolution calling for immediate congressional hearings on the Whitewater scandal.

Congressional hearings are our constitutional responsibility, and the American public deserves the truth.

Madam Speaker, it is very simple. There are only two steps the majority needs to take to help restore institutional accountability and public credibility:

First, minority leaders must have access to executive branch information.

And second, the majority leadership must act in good faith as honest brokers of the public's trust, rather than Hill barons bent on partisan manipulations.

Madam Speaker, we have been patient, but our nerves are wearing very thin, and more importantly so are those of the American people.

We need Whitewater hearings now.

HUSH MONEY

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means has negotiated a deal with the health care insurance industry: They stop running ads revealing the truth about the Clinton plan and they get some special breaks from the chairman.

This sounds like hush money to me.

A spokesman for the Committee on Ways and Means said:

The ads create negative vibes and make the decisions of members tougher. The absence of those ads and the public pressure from them improves the environment for closing the deal with members.

Madam Speaker, health care reform is an important public policy concern. The public has a right to know what is going on, and the so-called Harry and Louise ads have effectively informed the American people.

It is a shame that the chairman has worked so hard to keep the public from that information. And it is a shame that the health insurance industry has played along.

I just hope that the American people continue to pressure the Congress to get the kind of health care reform they want and need.

□ 1220

A CALL FOR BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, if we had referees in politics, the men in the black-and-white shirts would be running around blowing their whistles and talking about the piling-on offense. Everybody has been piling on the administration, saying they do not have a foreign policy.

I remember the old days when foreign policy used to be bipartisan and both sides came together to give their best advice rather than shout at each other because they remembered that once you left the shores, it was this great Nation's whole stance that was really being looked at.

So I would encourage those who are criticizing to come forward with some constructive criticism. I would say, Don't just say they don't know what they are doing, this is terrible, this is awful.

What should we do? These are very difficult issues. What should we do in Haiti? What should we do in North Korea? What should we do in Bosnia? What should we do in—and fill in the blanks. Let us stop criticizing and let us go back to the bipartisan tradition

that when we leave these shores, we all stand together as Americans shoulder to shoulder, and let us figure out what a good foreign policy in this New World that we live in really should be.

LET'S MAKE A DEAL

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, just like Monty Hall, columnist William Safire has called upon Members of Congress to make a deal on health reform. And like those disappointing gambles, he cites the obvious losers in the Clinton plan that are holding up the legislative process: Behind door No. 1, Government-imposed spending limits on health care that would require rationing; behind door No. 2, statewide collectives that would limit a patient's ability to choose his doctor; and worst of all, behind door No. 3, job-killing payroll taxes in the form of mandates. In contrast, Mr. Safire says a good deal for America lies in sensible reforms that target the obvious problems in the system without destroying what works. Republicans have a plan to ban pre-existing condition exclusions, allow for insurance portability, and attack health cost inflation—without new bureaucracies or huge new taxes. Simply put, Republicans do not have a deal—they have a solution.

UNDEREMPLOYMENT IS A MAJOR PROBLEM IN THE U.S. ECONOMY

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine reported last week that there have been at least 228,000 layoffs in this country in the past 4 months.

A national publication recently ran a cartoon with a sign saying: "Short Order Cook Wanted—Degree Preferred."

What a commentary on the times.

People are being laid off from high-paying jobs, and their only real options are jobs paying barely above minimum wage.

Young people are receiving college degrees, and the only places they can find employment are in fast-food restaurants.

I know that unemployment is just 6½ percent, which is too many, but it is relatively low.

But while unemployment is not presently a major problem, under employment is fast being one of the biggest problems we have in this Nation today.

And it will become an even worse problem if we do not let our free enterprise system work as it can and should.

Federal regulators, many with almost a policeman mentality, are regulating our economy into real jeopardy.

The goal of our Federal regulatory agencies should be to help small businesses succeed, not to regulate them into bankruptcy or forced mergers that destroy good jobs.

A WEAK FOREIGN POLICY IN A DANGEROUS WORLD

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

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, we live in a dangerous world. North Korea is acquiring nuclear weapons. The former Soviet States do have nuclear weapons. That situation is still somewhat unstable. Communist China is attempting to move into the formerly held position of the Soviet Union as the world's second superpower, claiming most of the territory in the South China Sea.

We have the Balkans continuing to explode, and we have continued instability in the Middle East.

It is a dangerous world, and against this backdrop of a very dangerous world, we have a President who is showing tremendous weakness in the area of foreign policy and national security.

President Clinton is slashing national defense. He is cashiering 1,700 young people a week out of the uniformed services. He has cut back our fighter forces to roughly 50 percent of what they were a couple of years ago. We are seeing now the first operations in maintenance slowdowns that led in the 1970's to a hollow force.

Madam Speaker, it is time to reverse our course and keep our powder dry. We have a dangerous world and a weak President. That is a bad combination

WITH GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND TAXES UP, INFLATION THREATENS TO RISE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. The news reports indicate that once again long-term interest rates are on the rise. We remember just a few weeks ago when Democrats were on this floor counting the President's economic program as a program that was keeping interest rates down, and particularly talking about long-term interest rates, about how the President's economic program was managing to keep long-term interest rates at historic lows.

The fact is that now, because of the President's economic program, interest rates are on the rise, the administration and some Democrats want to say, "Well, this is because of the Federal Reserve doing things that are wrong." The fact is that the Federal Reserve is responding to the reality of the President's economic program.

The President made clear in the campaign in 1992 that his economic program was to increase inflation. That is exactly what the analysis is now, that the President is putting inflation in place in the economy.

How are they doing this? Well, they are doing this by new taxes and with new government spending. Government spending is up, taxes are up, and the result is that inflation is poised to go up.

Why can we say that? Because the only thing holding it down at the present time is energy prices on the world market at historic lows. The moment those energy prices go up, the fact is that inflation is poised to go up and interest rates are reflecting that today the President's economic program is poised for disaster.

Madam Speaker, the President's economic program is something which we cannot afford to continue. We cannot afford to continue high taxes and we cannot continue to afford high government spending.

INSISTING ON ACCOUNTABILITY AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, an interesting view of reality was just espoused by my predecessor in the well. It is not the Federal Reserve Board that is raising interest rates? No, of course not, But I would ask: "It isn't?"

When did this flurry of higher interest rates start? It started with Mr. Greenspan and the radicals at the Federal Reserve Board who operate in secret for the interests of a certain few privileged in this country when they saw inflation on the horizon. Well, no one else did. But they said, "If we raise interest rates, then long-term rates will go down. Don't worry."

They raised interest rates, and long-term rates went up. They raised interest rates again, and long-term rates went up again.

Last week the Wall Street Journal and the special interests there begged the Federal Reserve to raise interest rates again, because they are only happy when they see a decline in the job outlook in the future of the economy of this country.

The Federal Reserve needs to be audited. They need to be brought back under control, and we need here in the Congress to take a little responsibility for their actions—something I am sure my colleague over there does not want to do.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 4453, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on

Rules, I call up House Resolution 433 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 433

Resolved, That during consideration of the bill (H.R. 4453) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LLOYD). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of general debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

All time yielded during consideration of this resolution is for the purposes of debate only.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 433 is an open rule which provides for the consideration of H.R. 4453, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995. Under the rules of the House, appropriations bills are privileged measures. Therefore this rule does not contain any provision allocating time for general debate. Debate time on the bill will be worked out in a unanimous-consent request agreed upon by the subcommittee chairman and the ranking minority member prior to the consideration of the bill.

This resolution does waive clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the consideration of the bill. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislation in general appropriations bill. This waiver is necessary because the authorizing bill for the legislation has not yet been signed into law.

Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits the reappropriation of unexpended balances of appropriations. This waiver is necessary because of a transfer of funds from the homeowners assistance fund to part 2 of the base realignment closure account. These waivers were discussed in the rules committee and were unopposed by any of its members.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4453 appropriates \$8.9 billion in fiscal year 1995 for military construction, family housing, and base closure. This amount is \$1.2 billion less than last year's appropriations level.

I would like to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle of the subcommittee who worked so hard to craft this bill during this time of fiscal belt tightening in the appropriations committee.

Madam Speaker, this bill appropriates approximately \$8.25 million for two projects at Wright Patterson Air Force Base which is partially located in my district. Funds are provided for a

special operations intelligence facility and for the upgrade of the bases' storm drainage system.

These projects are important to the people who live and work at the Wright Patterson Air Force Base and to the community of Dayton, OH. I thank my colleagues for including them in this legislation.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I would like to remind Members that under this rule any Member may offer an amendment that is germane to the bill. I urge adoption of the rule and adoption of the bill.

□ 1230

Mr. QUILLEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule providing for the consideration of the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995. As my colleagues from Ohio has explained, the rule provides certain waivers, and I am not aware of any objections to these waivers.

As usual, the members of the military construction subcommittee have brought forward a fiscally responsible bill which was crafted with a cooperative, bipartisan spirit that we all should strive to achieve. The bill is \$648 million below last year's level and is consistent with the recommendations of the defense authorization bill, which has been under consideration in the House.

Despite this reduction in spending, this committee did a great job in meeting the construction needs of our military, as well as providing for the housing needs of service personnel and meeting the costs associated with base closing and realignment.

Madam Speaker, this rule allows all Members to offer motions to strike or to offer germane amendments, and I am pleased to see the Rules Committee improving its record of reporting open rules. I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule so we can proceed with the prompt consideration of this first of 13 appropriations bills.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, I wanted to congratulate him for coming to the floor with his colleagues from the Committee on Rules with an open rule this time. That is one of the things that we would like to see more often, and I thank him for that.

The bill that we have before us today is the first of the appropriation bills that will arrive on the floor. This one, while it is above President Clinton's request, it is below last year's spending, and that is in itself a positive sign that we are attempting to bring down spending in some areas. But we ought

not fool ourselves as we approach this appropriations period. The spending levels of the Federal Government are still going to be enormously high.

The idea that the administration is promoting, that somehow the deficit problem has been solved, is just plain nonsense. The deficit that is predicted for this year and for all the years in the future is well above the deficit levels of the first 2 years of the Bush administration.

At that time, Democrats came to the floor on a consistent basis telling us about how these massive deficits were being compounded by the Bush administration over and above the Reagan administration. The deficits we are talking on an annual basis here are significantly higher than anything that was done during the Reagan administration and what was done in the first two years of the Bush administration. So we still do have a deficit problem.

We have a massive spending problem. That is compounded by the fact that 2 years ago the Democrats decided that as a part of their overall approach to the economy, they were also going to raise taxes. What you now see is unproductive dollars going into the economy at significant levels, unproductive dollars coming from government, and at the same time you see the productivity of our economy being taxed away by the Democrat tax increases of just a few months ago.

Those two things are the underlying problems for inflation in this economy which are causing us major problems. We had the gentleman from Oregon come here just a couple of minutes ago and say exactly what I predicted the Democrats would say. Democrats say the problem with long-term interest rates is the Fed, and what we ought to do is get more political control of the Federal Reserve.

You see, the Democrats want political control of everything. They now have political control of the Congress, of the administration, and what they cannot control is the monetary policy in the Fed. So now they are proposing to take their one-party government and extend it into the monetary policy of the country, despite the fact that with monetary policy we are simply attempting at the present time to deal with the underlying inflation that the President promised in his campaign he was going to bring back to the economy.

The President's economic program is based upon inflation. Inflation is now beginning to bubble up at levels just below the surface. The Fed is attempting to respond to that, and Democrats say first of all, their economic program is not at fault, and by the way, if it is, what we want to do is take it out of the hide of the Fed by taking political control of the Fed.

Those are prescriptions for economic disaster. We need to have the kind of

responsibility shown by Congress that will keep the spending down. In this first bill that is being brought before us under this rule, we do in fact have spending levels lower than last year. That is a positive sign. We are not going to have that as we go through the appropriations process and ultimately will end up spending at levels that increase the deficit markedly.

We are increasing deficits. We are increasing debt in this society. We cannot afford to do both. Middleclass Americans today bear \$17,000 worth of debt for each person based upon the spending that Congress has already done in the past. Middleclass America cannot afford the bills of the spending of this Congress. This Congress needs to become more responsible.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEFNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter on the bill (H.R. 4453).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LLOYD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. HEFNER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4453) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes; and pending that motion Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1239

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4453), with Mr. CARDIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present to the House, H.R. 4453, the fiscal year 1995 military construction appropriations bill.

The bill we are recommending totals \$8.8 billion which is below the subcommittee 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. The bill is over the President's request by \$470 million but under last year's level by \$647 million. I should also mention that last year, we were forced to reduce military construction by \$1.3 billion. So in 2 years, military construction was reduced by almost \$2 billion, which is a significant cut. What this means is that projects get deferred but the requirement remains.

The comparative numbers for the major components of the bill are shown on page 2 of the report. The comparison of the bill with last year's level shows that the military construction portion has been reduced by \$1.1 billion or 31 percent. The base closure recommendation, on the other hand, is \$500 above last year's level. The family housing recommendation remains at almost last year's level.

With regard to base closure, the bill provides \$2.7 billion for base realignment and closure as requested by the President. Of the \$2.7 billion, the committee recommends that at least \$500 million be allocated for environmental restoration.

I cannot stress enough how important family housing is to quality of life of our military families. The Department currently operates and maintains about 400,000 units of housing. Many of the units are old, some in excess of 32 years. The committee continues to support the housing program as an essential element to readiness as well as retention. For that reason, the committee is recommending \$706 million for construction of about 3600 new and replacement units and \$2.8 billion to operate and maintain the existing 400,000 units of housing.

With regard to authorization, the recommendations in this bill conform

to the House armed services authorization, as reported.

Let me just go over some of the other special features of the bill:

It provides \$450 million for new barracks.

It provides over \$200 million for environmental compliance type projects.

It provides \$29 million for child development centers.

It reduces the President's request for NATO funding by \$100 million in line with the authorization.

It provides \$50 million as an ongoing effort to reduce energy costs.

It provides \$300 million for medical facilities such as hospitals and clinics.

It provides for \$51 million as initial phase funding for chemical weapons destruction facilities at two locations.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my remarks, I want to express my appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee and especially the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. It's a pleasure to work with the gentlewoman from Nevada. This is why we are presenting to you a bipartisan bill and a good bill given the budget constraints we have to work with.

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

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

I am delighted today to bring to the floor, along with my chairman and friend, Mr. HEFNER, the bill making appropriations for military construction for fiscal year 1995.

There is no question that this is a tough year for all of us but I believe, in this bill, we have done the best job possible under our allocation, and in difficult budgetary circumstances, to address the needs of our military.

Mr. HEFNER has outlined the bill and I won't be redundant. I want to emphasize, however, that the Mil Con account has taken significant reductions since last year. With this reduced funding level, quality of life projects, readiness, replacement and environmental compliance will, unfortunately, be deferred while the important requirement remains.

Military construction is an investment program that has significant payback in economic terms, but also as it relates to environmental restoration and in better living and working conditions for our personnel. Quality of life issues are important to these men and women, as well as their families, and we must strive to provide the best possible infrastructure for their well being.

The subcommittee has worked very hard to balance these needs with this reduced allocation. I support this bill, it is a truly bipartisan bill and a very balanced and fair bill.

I would also like to thank the members of the subcommittee for their hard work and cooperation during our hear-

ing process. And, I want to commend the hard work and assistance of our staff—their work has been exemplary.

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLETTA].

Mr. FOGLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, H.R. 4453, military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1995.

I would like to congratulate my chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], on his outstanding effort in putting together a military construction bill which strives to meet our defense priorities under these very difficult fiscal conditions. In doing so, our subcommittee was able to drastically reduce spending by \$620 million. We made the tough choices to fund our defense infrastructure requirements in this changing world.

This bill improves the quality of life for our military personnel and their families stationed at home and overseas.

It cleans up military facilities scheduled for closure so that affected communities can move quickly to redevelop these sites and create jobs.

Finally, it meets our defense needs so that American men and women in uniform are prepared to meet any threat to our national security.

Again, I congratulate my chairman and the ranking member, and urge the Members to vote "yes" on this bill.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I want to commend her and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for a well-crafted bill.

I have noticed a few concerns that the committee voiced and I echo those concerns from the Mil Con side on the Committee on Armed Services.

We are spending now an inordinate amount of money on environmental compliance. In fact, the Navy's military construction budget of \$320 million consisted of 27 percent environmental compliance projects versus 24 percent for essential mission support projects. Some of that comes about because if a base commander does not meet his environmental compliance requirements and the EPA is after him, he may go to jail if he does not spend defense dollars on environmental compliance. If he fails to spend defense dollars on mission essential military construction projects and readiness, some of his troops may die in battle. But those projects are always deferred because of environmental compliance projects.

I would suggest that we need to get a handle on environmental compliance projects. I think this committee is

very, very interested in doing that. We are interested in doing that on the authorization side.

Lastly, in the hearings that we developed, I know the committee has had the same problems. The average base commander now has to understand and be aware of about 10,000 pages of Federal regulation on environmental compliance, which puts a massive, massive burden on him. I would hope that as we get into this process next year, we can look at some way to alleviate that massive burden that is now being shifted to base commanders and taking away their precious time from readiness and training.

I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their very excellent job on this bill.

□ 1250

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations. The way they conduct their work is exemplary, and the people on the committee are committed to the lives of our military men.

I think it is very fitting 2 or 3 days before Memorial Day that the military construction budget comes before the Congress, because this appropriation is so important to the quality of life of the young men and young women who have dedicated their lives to the military.

I compliment my chairman because of the way he conducts the work of this committee. I compliment our ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] and the gentlewoman from Nevada have given the leadership to this committee which all committees need, and that is giving the direction we need to do a good job. I want to thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for the fact that they had a budget which was much under budget from last year, and they used their resources to spread this money around so that the military could receive the kind of help it needs.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment that I was going to offer to reduce the appropriation for the military construction, but I think if I get some answers on this that are reasonable, I probably will not introduce it.

Mr. Chairman, this is about \$647.2 million below fiscal year 1994, so it is

about 7 percent below last year's appropriation, but it is about \$470.47 million or 5.6 percent above President Clinton's request.

I went through this list, Mr. Chairman, and started looking State by State at all the new projects, or all the projects that money was being appropriated for. It is very difficult to find out whether or not those are really absolutely necessary, so I would just like to talk to my colleagues, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], to find out how these 125 projects which were added by the Committee on Appropriations, how they came up with this list and whether or not they are absolutely necessary.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I could not stand up here and take an oath that every one of these projects is absolutely critical to the existence of this country, but they were all authorized. There was not one project in this bill that is not authorized. There was some \$1.5 billion requested for add-ons, and we did not have money to even come close to doing those. Every one of those projects is authorized.

To the very best of our ability, we went through all these projects as best we could and determined that they were all viable projects. With the limited funds we had, we think that the committee as a whole and the staff did a very good job of screening all these projects. They are all viable and they deserve the Members' support.

I thank the gentleman for not offering his amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might ask the gentleman another question or two, Mr. Chairman, were some of these projects necessitated because of the cutbacks in the active duty force, active military?

Mr. HEFNER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, some of them were due to the fact that we are bringing forces back from Europe. Certainly that had some bearing on the overall picture of the bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there were 125 projects, according to my staff, that were added by the Committee on Appropriations that were not requested by the President. If I can ask one more question, could you give me a rough idea of the 125 projects added by the Committee on Appropriations that were not asked for by the President, why those were added?

Mr. HEFNER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, we funded four barracks projects in Korea where our soldiers are in a high-stressed environment. We cut back on NATO spending. We had a real need in Korea. General Luck came from Fort Bragg, one of our

more distinguished people, and it was absolutely necessary that we have this money for the quality of life for the men in Korea.

We had requests from Members from the appropriations committees and authorizing committees and all the other committees. We looked at all the projects, we looked at whether they were 35 percent design, whether they were critical to whatever service component the Guard or Reserve and whether they were viable projects.

Again, I think we have done an excellent job of putting together this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, because I am very concerned about the strength of our military and because I have confidence in both the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentlewoman from Nevada, I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the military construction appropriations bill. In the face of severe fiscal constraints, the subcommittee has successfully crafted a balanced spending bill for the next fiscal year. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I would particularly like to recognize the chairman, BILL HEFNER, and ranking member BARBARA VUCANOVICH for their invaluable assistance to include funding for a major military installation in my district. Funding provided in the bill goes a long way to provide the base with the facilities they need to adequately carry out the base's readiness mission. I greatly appreciate the consideration and attention given by the chairman and ranking member to these needs.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4453, military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1995, and to thank the distinguished chairman, BILL HEFNER, the ranking member, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, and all the members of the Subcommittee on Military Construction for their efforts on behalf of American military personnel and their families. I also want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee staff and the associate staff for their hard work in support of the product before us today.

The bill contains projects vital to the morale, recruitment, and retention of U.S. military personnel across the country and around the world. Not only does the bill relate to critical construction projects, but also contains provisions important to our ability to field new weapon systems, environmental concerns, family housing, child care facilities, and the educational and recreational needs of military families. Finally, it also addresses the important issues related to base realignment and closure.

I also want to thank the subcommittee for its consideration and inclusion of construction activities at Fort Bliss, TX, located in my congressional district, and home of the Army's Air Defense Artillery Center. All of the projects included in the legislation were authorized by the Department of Defense authorization bill, and I want to thank my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee for their hard work as well.

The President's fiscal year 1995 budget recommendations contained family housing im-

provements at Fort Bliss, and I appreciate the inclusion of these critical quality of life projects for military families in my district. These were among the priority projects I am supporting in the pending legislation. Others include expansion of the Sergeant Majors' Academy, construction of a child development center, and construction of a maintenance facility. I also want to point out for the RECORD that the report accompanying H.R. 4453 directs the Army to accelerate efforts to replace or modernize barracks at Fort Bliss and to request funds for this purpose as part of the fiscal year 1996 budget submission in order to continue with the barracks upgrade program on post.

In closing, let me once again thank the committee and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, each year, the military construction appropriation is referred to as the quality of life bill for our troops.

This bill is \$647 million less than last year's bill, but still \$470 million more than the President requested.

In my opinion, our troops deserve more, but we are constrained by our committee's 602(b) allocation.

This bill is a classic example of the administration's priorities which consider military funds a piggy bank for an ambitious social agenda.

During our hearings, Members from both sides of the aisle asked the Army, Navy, and Air Force whether the requested funds were sufficient. The services—good soldiers that they are—all answered in the affirmative.

I agree with my colleagues on the committee that DOD has asked for too little.

I am heartened that the bill contains money for improving the living conditions for our troops stationed just below the DMZ in Korea. We heard testimony that our troops must walk outside to use latrines. This is not acceptable—especially considering the brutal winters in Korea.

The bill also contains money for a fire station at the Naval Academy. Current law mandates that DOD facilities must maintain on post capabilities to fight fires—and that this cannot be contracted out. This bill provides money for a much-needed fire station.

Other projects have been included, but not enough to address the needs of our military.

I find it ironic that so many Members are calling for intervention around the world and yet at the same time are continuing to vote for cutbacks to our military.

If we do not want a hollow military then we must reorder our priorities and start funding military programs. We must also ensure that our troops have adequate housing.

I urge an "aye" vote for this bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would express his thanks to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and the distinguished ranking member, the gentlelady from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], for their efforts in presenting an appropriations bill that addresses the construction needs of our armed forces while exhibiting considerable fiscal restraint. This Member is fully aware of the budgetary constraints that the subcommittee faced, and he applauds the constructive and bipartisan approach that is reflected in H.R. 4453.

In particular, this Member is appreciative of the subcommittee's continued support of the Nebraska Air National Guard. The Nebraska Air Guard is in the midst of a conversion from a reconnaissance unit to an air refueling squadron. The Nebraska Air Guard has enthusiastically embraced this new mission, and is anxious to assume this critical support role.

As the subcommittee knows, however, the new KC-135 tankers are much larger than the squadron's old RC-4 photoreconnaissance aircraft, and the refueling tankers require a new support system. This year's appropriation contains much-needed funding for underground fuel storage tanks and for a hydrant refueling system. Appropriation of these funds helps to ensure that the conversion will occur on time, and without unnecessary hardship.

This Member thanks the subcommittee for their support, and urges approval of H.R. 4453.

NEBRASKA

Installation and project	Budget request	House recommended
Air Force Offutt AFB:		
Storm drainage facilities	1,500	1,500
Underground fuel storage tanks	760	760
Air National Guard Lincoln Map:		
Parking apron and hydrant refueling system	14,274	14,274
Replace underground fuel storage tanks	500	500
Total, Nebraska	17,034	17,034

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, for military construction functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$623,511,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed \$67,700,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities,

and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$462,701,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$47,900,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$514,977,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$55,900,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$467,169,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$45,960,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$134,235,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$209,843,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities

for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$39,121,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$12,348,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$56,378,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

For the United States share of the cost of North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure programs for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in military construction Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, \$119,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$160,602,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,121,208,000; in all \$1,281,810,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$269,035,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$853,599,000; in all \$1,122,634,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$276,482,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$801,345,000 of which not more than \$14,200,000 may be obligated for the acquisition of family housing units at Corniso AB, Italy; in all \$1,077,827,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of

Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$350,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1999; for Operation and maintenance, \$29,031,000; in all \$29,381,000.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART I

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526), \$87,600,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be obligated for base realignment and closure activities under Public Law 100-526 which would cause the Department's \$1,800,000,000 cost estimate for military construction and family housing related to the Base Realignment and Closure Program to be exceeded: *Provided further*, That not less than \$66,800,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$265,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$138,700,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration: *Provided further*, That, in addition, not to exceed \$133,000,000 may be transferred from "Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense" to "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part II", to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$2,322,858,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$302,700,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction

of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. No part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 per centum of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, or (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, or (c) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000, or (d) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to (1) acquire land, (2) provide for site preparation, or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. No part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan or in any NATO member country, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 per centum.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel thirty days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 114. Unexpended balances in the Military Family Housing Management Account

established pursuant to section 2831 of title 10, United States Code, as well as any additional amounts which would otherwise be transferred to the Military Family Housing Management Account, shall be transferred to the appropriations for Family Housing, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, based on the sources from which the funds were derived, and shall be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which they have been transferred.

SEC. 115. Not more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 116. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 117. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects, and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 119. During the five-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense" to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 120. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Japan and Korea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 121. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, pro-

ceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991, to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

SEC. 122. The second paragraph under the heading, "Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps" in title XI of Public Law 102-368, is amended by inserting "and the August 8, 1993 earthquake in Guam" immediately after "Typhoon Omar".

SEC. 123. (a) Of the budgetary resources available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing accounts during fiscal year 1995, \$10,421,000 are permanently canceled.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall allocate the amount of budgetary resources canceled among the Department's military construction and family housing accounts available for procurement and procurement-related expenses. Amounts available for procurement and procurement-related expenses in each such account shall be reduced by the amount allocated to such account.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the definition of "procurement" includes all stages of the process of acquiring property or services, beginning with the process of determining a need for a product or services and ending with contract completion and close-out, as specified in 41 U.S.C. 403(2).

SEC. 124. COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.

No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 125. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 126. PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS.

If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a fraudulent label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that was not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. HEFNER (during the reading).
Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill

through page 18, line 17, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1995."

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARDIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4453) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

□ 1300

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Mr. HEFNER. 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 380, nays 42, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—380

Abercrombie	Baker (LA)	Berman
Ackerman	Ballenger	Bevill
Andrews (ME)	Barcia	Bilbray
Andrews (NJ)	Barrett (NE)	Bilirakis
Andrews (TX)	Bartlett	Bishop
Applegate	Barton	Blackwell
Armey	Bateman	Billey
Bacchus (FL)	Becerra	Blute
Bachus (AL)	Beilenson	Boehrlert
Baessler	Bentley	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Bereuter	Bonilla

Bonior	Grams	McHugh
Borski	Green	McInnis
Boucher	Greenwood	McKeon
Brewster	Gunderson	McKinney
Brooks	Gutierrez	McMillan
Browder	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Brown (CA)	Hall (TX)	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Hamburg	Meek
Brown (OH)	Hamilton	Menendez
Bryant	Hansen	Meyers
Byrne	Harman	Mfume
Callahan	Hastert	Mica
Calvert	Hastings	Michel
Canady	Hayes	Miller (CA)
Cantwell	Hefley	Mineta
Cardin	Hefner	Mink
Carr	Herger	Moakley
Castle	Hilliard	Molinar
Chapman	Hinchee	Mollohan
Clay	Hoagland	Montgomery
Clayton	Hobson	Moorhead
Clement	Hochbrueckner	Moran
Clinger	Hoekstra	Morella
Clyburn	Holden	Murphy
Coleman	Hoyer	Murtha
Collins (GA)	Huffington	Myers
Collins (IL)	Hughes	Nadler
Collins (MI)	Hunter	Neal (MA)
Combest	Hutchinson	Neal (NC)
Condit	Hutto	Oberstar
Conyers	Hyde	Obey
Cooper	Inglis	Olver
Coppersmith	Inhofe	Orton
Costello	Insee	Owens
Coyne	Istook	Oxley
Cramer	Jacobs	Packard
Crane	Jefferson	Pallone
Crapo	Johnson (CT)	Parker
Cunningham	Johnson (GA)	Pastor
Danner	Johnson (SD)	Payne (NJ)
Darden	Johnson, E. B.	Payne (VA)
de la Garza	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Deal	Kanjorski	Peterson (FL)
DeLauro	Kaptur	Petri
Dellums	Kasich	Pickett
Derrick	Kennedy	Pickle
Deutsch	Kennelly	Pombo
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Pomeroy
Dickey	Kim	Porter
Dicks	King	Portman
Dingell	Kingston	Poshard
Dixon	Kleczka	Price (NC)
Dooley	Klein	Pryce (OH)
Dornan	Klink	Quillen
Durbin	Knollenberg	Rahall
Edwards (CA)	Kolbe	Rangel
Edwards (TX)	Kopetski	Ravenel
Emerson	Kreidler	Reed
Engel	Kyl	Regula
English	LaFalce	Reynolds
Eshoo	Lambert	Richardson
Evans	Lancaster	Ridge
Everett	Lantos	Roberts
Ewing	LaRocco	Roemer
Farr	Laughlin	Rogers
Fazio	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Fields (LA)	Leach	Rose
Filner	Levin	Rostenkowski
Fingerhut	Levy	Roukema
Fish	Lewis (CA)	Rowland
Flake	Lewis (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Foglietta	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Ford (MI)	Lightfoot	Sabo
Ford (TN)	Lipinski	Sanders
Fowler	Livingston	Sangmeister
Frank (MA)	Lloyd	Santorum
Franks (CT)	Long	Sarpalius
Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Sawyer
Frost	Lucas	Saxton
Furse	Machtley	Schaefer
Galleghy	Maloney	Schenk
Gallo	Mann	Schiff
Gejdenson	Manton	Schroeder
Gekas	Margolies-	Schumer
Gephardt	Mezvinsky	Scott
Geren	Markey	Serrano
Gibbons	Martinez	Sharp
Gilchrest	Mazzoli	Shaw
Gillmor	McCandless	Shays
Gilman	McCloskey	Shepherd
Gingrich	McCollum	Shuster
Glickman	McCrery	Sisisky
Gonzalez	McCurdy	Skaggs
Goodlatte	McDade	Skeen
Goodling	McDermott	Skelton
Gordon	McHale	Slattery

Slaughter	Tanner	Volkmer
Smith (IA)	Tauzin	Vucanovich
Smith (MI)	Taylor (MS)	Walsh
Smith (NJ)	Taylor (NC)	Waters
Smith (OR)	Tejeda	Watt
Smith (TX)	Thomas (CA)	Waxman
Snowe	Thomas (WY)	Weldon
Spence	Thompson	Wheat
Spratt	Thornton	Whitten
Stearns	Torkildsen	Williams
Stenholm	Torres	Wilson
Stokes	Torricelli	Wise
Strickland	Towns	Wolf
Studds	Trafficant	Woolsey
Stump	Tucker	Wynn
Stupak	Unsoeld	Yates
Sundquist	Valentine	Young (AK)
Swift	Velazquez	Young (FL)
Synar	Vento	Zeliff
Talent	Visclosky	Zimmer

NAYS—42

Allard	Ehlers	Penny
Archer	Fawell	Peterson (MN)
Barca	Fields (TX)	Quinn
Bunning	Goss	Ramstad
Burton	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Hoke	Roth
Camp	Johnston	Royce
Coble	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Linder	Solomon
DeFazio	Manzullo	Stark
Doolittle	Miller (FL)	Thurman
Dreier	Minge	Upton
Duncan	Nussle	Walker
Dunn	Paxon	Wyden

NOT VOTING—11

Barlow	Horn	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Houghton	Swett
DeLay	Lehman	Washington
Grandy	Matsui	

□ 1324

Messrs. BURTON of Indiana, QUINN, and BARCA of Wisconsin, and Mrs. THURMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and therefore failed to cast my vote on rollcall vote No. 193, relating to final passage of H.R. 4453, the fiscal year 1995 military construction appropriations bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

TIME FOR THE NATIONAL OBSERVANCE OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 315) designating May 30, 1994, through June 6, 1994, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not ob-

ject, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 315, a joint resolution to designate May 30, 1994, through June 6, 1994, as a "Time for the National Observance of the 50th Anniversary of World War II." It is with pleasure and pride that I cosponsored this joint resolution, and I commend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for having authored this measure.

World War II was a war unlike any other we have fought. It killed more persons, cost more money, damaged more property, affected more people, and probably caused more far-reaching changes than any other war in history. Those of us who remember and served in World War II still harbor vivid memories of the determination and unity with which the American people conducted themselves. Throughout this titanic struggle, during which the battle lines between good and evil were clearly drawn, Americans in all 48 States and abroad came together for a common purpose.

Mr. Speaker, at its height, more than 50 countries took part in the war and more than 55 million people died. The cost of the war is estimated to be approximately \$1,154 trillion. In addition, World War II eliminated the perilous scourge of nazism from the face of the world and freed the thousands of Jews held prisoner in brutal captivity. Unfortunately, millions of others were not saved. The war stopped the tyrannical worldwide conquest by Japan and by dictators Hitler and Mussolini. More importantly, beyond the results of the war, World War II reconfirmed the United States promise to protect liberty and freedom throughout the world.

Veterans and civilians of the World War II era, and all citizens throughout our Nation, recognize the importance of the conflict. Hundreds of thousands of Americans died to preserve and uphold the democratic ideals and institutions which the United States dearly maintains. This war required the mobilization not only of armies but of technologies, economies, and whole peoples. As a result, our entire Nation took part in this noble effort and thus this resolution is an excellent vehicle to once again say "thank you" and pay tribute to those left among us who gave of their time, their efforts, and their hearts to the struggle which helped bring about V-E Day and V-J Day.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud that the House of Representatives is taking up and considering House Joint Resolution 315, designating May 30, 1994, through June 6, 1994, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II." Two hundred and twenty-five members of the House and over

51 Senators have already shown their support for this commemorative legislation by cosponsoring this bill.

This legislation brings special focus to the Americans who through dedication, hard work, and commitment helped the United States and the Allied Forces to be victorious over tyranny and aggression. We must remember to honor the millions of Americans who defended democracy. We learned through the hard lessons of war that we must remain vigilant and always prepared to resist future aggression and that all nations dedicated to freedom must stand together.

American women as well as men served our country in the military. During World War II opportunities and choices for women increased. Our Government asked women to put aside private concerns and accept more public roles and women accepted the call by working in defense plants, became nurses, and came to the aid of our country in previously untraditional roles for women such as heavy manufacturing work.

It has been documented that from 1940 until the Japanese surrendered, the United States produced more than 300,000 aircraft, over 86,000 tanks, and 12.5 million rifles. In addition, over 100 aircraft carriers, 352 destroyers were built during this time. These figures exemplify our tremendous efforts here at home to support the effort of our men and women fighting over in Europe and in the Pacific.

During this commemoration, Americans of all ages must remember that many, many Americans gave their lives so that our Nation could remain free and strong. It is my hope that this legislation will help us to be mindful of this important event in our past and to always remember its importance for our future.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker. It is an honor for me to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 315, a joint resolution designating May 30, 1994 through June 6, 1994 as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II." I wish to commend our colleague from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], who has taken the lead in this matter and has brought this measure to the floor.

It is also appropriate today, as we remember our former First Lady, Jacqueline (Kennedy) Onassis, to remember the service that her husband, President John F. Kennedy, performed during World War II as a young Navy lieutenant. President Kennedy said that stories of the past teach courage, offer hope, and provide inspiration. The men and women of World War II will forever remain an inspiration because of their selfless heroism.

For many, the events of World War II are indelibly marked in our minds. However, at least 70 percent of our population was not born until after this milestone—many of our Vietnam War heroes were born after America became involved in World War II. We must communicate the valor and immeasurable sacrifices made by those who fought this war.

The American involvement in World War II was supported by the country. As a nation, we could not tolerate the heinous massacre of millions and the dissolution of personal freedom. Wars, today, do not appear to be as clearly good or bad, right or wrong, as World War II. Following World War II, our country participated in the Korean and Vietnam con-

licts, and, more recently, the Persian Gulf war. Within the past 5 years, we have witnessed the fall of the Iron Curtain, the collapse of Communist regimes, the unification of Germany, solidarity in South Africa and tragic situations in Bosnia, in Somalia and in Rwanda. Much has happened within these 50 years. Though it is not likely that we will obliterate the valuable lessons we learned from that war, it is particularly appropriate that the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II be recognized by proper ceremonies so that all generations can learn from the experience of World War II.

As a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 315, I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 315

Whereas the brave men and women of the United States of America made tremendous sacrifices during World War II to save the world from tyranny and aggression;

Whereas the winds of freedom and democracy sweeping the globe today spring from the principles for which over four hundred thousand Americans gave their lives in World War II;

Whereas World War II and the events that led up to that war must be understood in order that we may better understand our own times, and more fully appreciate the reasons why eternal vigilance against any form of tyranny is so important;

Whereas the World War II era, as reflected in its family life, industry, and entertainment, was a unique period in American history and epitomized our Nation's philosophy of hard work, courage, and tenacity in the face of adversity;

Whereas, between 1991 and 1995, over nine million American veterans of World War II will be holding reunions and conferences and otherwise commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of various events relating to World War II; and

Whereas June 4, 1994, marks the anniversary of the Battle of Midway, and June 6, 1994, marks the anniversary of D-Day; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That May 30, 1994, through June 6, 1994, is designated as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe that period with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be dis-

charged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 179) to designate the week of June 12 through 19, 1994, as "National Men's Health Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not object, I wish to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House passed legislation today to designate June 12 through 19, 1994, as "National Men's Health Week." As we consider health care reform, prevention and early detection of disease will become increasingly important in saving health care dollars. The shift to prevention requires not only changes in the health care system, but also an awareness by the American public of the importance of regular visits to their physicians.

Prostate cancer is the most common cancer in men, afflicting 1 out of every 11 American men and killing 34,000 men every year. For African-American men, the rate of affliction is even worse; African-American men have the highest incidence of prostate cancer in the world. In the past 5 years, the death rate for prostate cancer has grown at almost twice the death rate of breast cancer.

Prostate cancer and many other health problems affecting men could be avoided if men's awareness of health screening tests were increased. Heightening the awareness of preventable health problems and increasing early detection and treatment of disease would significantly improve our Nation's health, as well as save limited health care dollars.

Recognizing and preventing men's health problems is not just a man's issue. Because of its impact on wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters, men's health is truly a family issue.

I thank the chairman, Mr. CLAY, for bringing this legislation to designate men's health week forward. I also thank my colleagues for co-sponsoring this vital legislation. I especially thank Mr. Jimmy Boyd of the men's health network for his tireless efforts on behalf of this legislation.

This legislation is important as it will help to raise awareness of these important issues. I am pleased that the House has sent this positive message today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 179

Whereas despite the advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of 7 years less than women;

Whereas the likelihood that a man will develop prostate cancer is 1 in 11;

Whereas the number of men contracting prostate cancer will reach over 120,000 in 1993, with an expected one-third of the cases to die from the disease;

Whereas testicular cancer is one of the most common cancers in men aged 15-34, and when detected early, has an 87 percent survival rate;

Whereas the number of men contracting lung disease will reach over 100,000 in 1993, with an expected 85 percent of the cases to die from the disease;

Whereas the number of cases of colon cancer among men will reach over 80,000 in 1993; with nearly one-third of the cases to die from the disease;

Whereas the death rate for prostate cancer has grown at almost twice the death rate of breast cancer in the last five years;

Whereas African-American men in the United States have the highest incidence in the world of cancer of the prostate;

Whereas men are seven times as likely as women to be arrested for drunk driving and three times as likely to be alcoholics;

Whereas women visit the doctor 150 percent as often as men, enabling them to detect health problems in their early stages;

Whereas significant numbers of male related health problems such as prostate cancer, testicular cancer, infertility, and colon cancer, could be detected and treated if men's awareness of these problems was more pervasive;

Whereas educating both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection of male health problems will result in reducing rates of mortality for these diseases;

Whereas appropriate use of tests such as Prostate Specific Antigen (PSA) exams, blood pressure screens, cholesterol screens, etc., in conjunction with clinical examination and self-testing for problems such as testicular cancer can result in the detection of many of these problems in their early stages and increases in the survival rates to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas many men are reluctant to visit their health center or physician for regular screening examinations of male related problems for a variety of reasons including fear, lack of information, and cost factors; and

Whereas men who are educated about the value that preventive health can play in prolonging their lifespan and their role as a productive family member will be more likely to participate in health screenings; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That June 12 through 19, 1994, is designated as National Men's Health Week, and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate programs and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 315 and Senate Joint Resolution 179, the two joint resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Chair's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The Journal was approved.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NO. 2 AS SUBSTITUTE FOR AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN PART 4 OF HOUSE REPORT 103-520 ON H.R. 4301, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 2 in part 4 of House Report 103-520 be considered as a substitute amendment for amendment No. 1 in part 4.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to explain what it is he is trying to accomplish.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it was the clear intent of the Committee on Rules, as shown by the committee's document entitled, "Proposed Second Rule" of May 20 at 1:30 p.m. The report itself is ambiguous, and this request is intended only to clarify the situation.

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], is the author of an amendment relating to foreign policy matters with respect to Haiti. This gentleman offered an amendment that was intended to be an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Committee on Rules intended for this to be the case, but their report was ambiguous on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, this unanimous consent request is simply a desire to clarify that the gentleman from California would have an opportunity to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to my distinguished colleague's amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for that explanation.

Part of the problem that we have had with this is the order that we are going to take these matters up, and part of the understanding that the chairman has referred to in those records of the Committee on Rules was that we would deal with the Haiti issue before we broke, presumably by the end of this week, and I wonder if the distinguished

chairman could give me assurances that we are going to deal with this Haiti amendment series in the immediate future and certainly before the end of this week.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it would be the intent of this gentleman and my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], to dispose of this matter this evening. It would be our intent to debate the issue and have a vote on the issue on the floor of the House on this matter before we adjourn tonight.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the distinguished chairman, and I yield to the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] who would like to ask an additional question if it is appropriate under my reservation of objections.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to have an understanding that we are also going to discuss peacekeeping.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman is aware, as I understand it as of this moment, the amendment dealing with Bosnia, by unanimous agreement or agreement among a number of parties here, that issue would be pulled from the floor. But as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, we will go forward. It is the intent of the Chair to go forward on the issue of base closure, C-17, Haiti and peacekeeping.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has answered the question.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, that certainly takes care of my concerns, so I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 4301, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 5 of House Resolution 431, I ask that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union recognize for consideration of amendments out of the order printed by transposing the proceedings contemplated by section 3(b) of that resolution with the proceedings contemplated by section 3(e) of that resolution.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Does this relate to the amendment which deals with Bosnia?

Mr. DELLUMS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Is the gentleman asking for unanimous consent, or is he announcing this?

Mr. DELLUMS. I am announcing that this shift be made.

As I understand it, this is an agreement among the leadership, the authors of the amendment and the leadership on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I will object.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, this is simply an announcement because, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is aware, under the rule this gentleman is given the right, within 1 hour of the proposed debate, to make such an announcement, and I am simply carrying out my duties and responsibilities and rights under the rule.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the body, if it were a unanimous-consent request, I might well object to this. I believe we are making a mistake. I believe we have an issue, as the distinguished gentleman so often indicates, of great import and of great moral impact. It is an issue that relates to whether or not the United States and its Western allies are going to stand by while we see genocide being perpetrated, war crimes being perpetrated. That is the issue that this House, through this amendment, sought to deal with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is an opinion of some that delaying it until after the President goes to Europe is good strategy. I disagree with that. I think it is time for this country and this Congress to say to our European allies that enough is enough. It is time to stand up. It is time to act. It is time to send a clear, unequivocal and important message to those who would commit more crimes in this new world order.

I understand that this is a request of the chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is making a statement to the leadership of this body, not to this gentleman. I am prepared to debate this issue anytime, anyplace, anywhere. This decision was made above this gentleman's pay grade, and I hope in the context of the gentleman's remarks he made it clear he was speaking to the Speaker and not to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand very much the concerns of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland. Within the last 5 minutes I talked to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the majority whip, but I guess it was his understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there is not an agreement quite yet.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could delay this being announced, if we could delay it 20, 30 minutes. I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is trying to reach the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] right now.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I might say to my colleague that the rule gives this gentleman 1 hour prior to the time that the issue is debated. So, I am carrying out my responsibilities at this moment in a timely fashion. I have been led to believe that this matter had been worked out among various parties, including yourself, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the Speaker, and several other Members here.

Now, if I am being misguided, then I am concerned about that. But I am simply carrying out my duties and my responsibilities.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, if we could have 10 minutes before this decision, possibly we could go ahead. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] in the last 5 minutes told me that there was no final understanding yet. If we could just have 10 minutes, say for several of us to get together, I am sure this would be no problem in 10 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my announcement.

CLARIFICATION

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the record, I want to make it very clear to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as he has so often said, I do not deal on this issue with personalities. I do not deal with levels of responsibility. This is a broader issue than the leadership, or the chairman, or this gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I think I almost paraphrased word for word the statements that the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, so often makes. This is an issue of policy; I suggest high policy. I have no difference with the gentleman. He has the right under the rule. I believe

a correct representation was made to him, and I appreciate very much his actions in giving us a few minutes to discuss this issue further.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I am a person who respects his integrity and his intellectual honesty, and I know that he respects that in others as well.

□ 1340

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILBRAY). Pursuant to House Resolution 431 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4301.

□ 1341

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, with Mr. DURBIN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, May 23, 1994, the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 431, it is now in order to consider the amendment printed in part 2 of House Report 103-520.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HANSEN

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANSEN: At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. . POSTPONEMENT OF 1995 ROUND OF BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS UNTIL 1997.

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended—

(1) in subsections (c)(1)(B)(iii), (c)(1)(C), (e)(1), and (l) of section 2902, section 2903(c)(1), and section 2909(a), by striking out "1995" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1997"; and

(2) in section 2902(c)(1)(B)(iii), by striking out "104th Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof "105th Congress".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 15 minutes in support of his amendment, and a Member in opposition, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds, I wish to designate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], who chairs the subcommittee of jurisdiction on this matter, to sit in my stead in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has that authority, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] will be recognized in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today would defer the 1995 round of base closures and realignments to 1997. I do not offer this amendment lightly or, as some would have this House believe, as a parochial exercise to protect unneeded bases.

I supported the creation of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. I have supported the closure and realignment of some facilities in the State of Utah and I have opposed others. But, I believe the time has come to depart from the theory of BRAC and deal with its reality; to dispense with rhetoric and confront the facts.

The facts are uncomfortable.

First, despite anything you will hear from the opposition, BRAC is underfunded. The first three rounds—1988, 1991, and 1993—are estimated to cost over \$17 billion. Only \$12.6 billion has been expended. You will hear that between 90 and 95 percent of BRAC requirements are being funded. Yet, if you go into the field and talk to base commanders you will see the reality.

The Los Angeles Times reported on April 21 on the lack of progress in relocating the Marines from El Toro, CA. As the Times put it, "the Marines' on-again, off-again approach to the move is dictated by the uncertainty of the Department of Defense to pay for it."

Navy Times reported on May 23 that "one Marine Corps officer in New Orleans familiar with base closure said plans to move Marine Corps Reserve squadrons from air stations in Dallas, Glenview, TX, and Memphis, TN, to a joint reserve base in Fort Worth have been on hold because there is no money."

Finally, I have gone into my own district. For this fiscal year, the Tooele Army Depot has validated requirements for \$7.7 million in BRAC-related expenses. So far, they have received \$43,312. That's hardly 90 percent.

Second, there is a huge BRAC backlog. Of the 147 bases slated for closure so far, only 46 of those closures have actually been completed. Of the 100 realignments, only a paltry 6 have been resolved.

DOD apparently objects to this statement of fact. DOD complains that it takes time to close a base—3 to 6 years.

OK. Let us look at the 1988 round—the round that should be completed by now. Despite the fact that it was the smallest—and cheapest—of any prior round, about 20 percent of the bases slated for closure in 1988 remain open and 30 percent of all actions taken in that round have yet to be resolved.

Mr. Chairman, there is an undeniable funding shortfall and facilities backlog.

Third, BRAC costs are increasing and expected savings are not being realized. The General Accounting Office has reported on more than one occasion that the cost of BRAC-related environmental cleanup is increasing above prior estimates. The Congressional Budget Office reported earlier this month that DOD has underestimated those costs alone by 60 percent. GAO has also reported that revenue from land sales—a key component of expected savings from BRAC—has plummeted.

DOD has revised its own savings estimates downward. For the 1988 round—the round with which we have the most experience—DOD has cut its estimate of expected savings by 52 percent. According to Robert Bayer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, the break-even point—the point at which the taxpayer will get some relief—for the first three BRAC rounds will not be seen until fiscal year 1997—nearly 3 years from now at the earliest.

Paul Johnson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, was even more blunt in an assessment offered on March 8. He stated, "we have not saved a whole lot."

Into this morass, Mr. Chairman, the administration hopes to dump at least 15 percent of current infrastructure in the 1995 round. BRAC 1995 would, therefore, be at least as large as all of the previous rounds combined.

Yet, in spite of the fact that there are enormous up-front costs involved in closing or realigning a facility, inside the Pentagon reported in February that DOD did not budget funds for the 1995-1999 future years defense plan.

Proceeding with such a large undertaking when BRAC is already underfunded and behind schedule is poor management and can only lead to longer delays—and increased costs—in the BRAC process.

Why then does DOD insist on going ahead with a round in 1995 when only 2 weeks ago Secretary Perry and other senior officials were suggesting that another round might be needed to accommodate BRAC within current budget constraints? There can only be one answer.

BRAC has become an entirely budget-driven exercise to produce paper savings supporting an underfunded defense budget. The irony is that a huge 1995 round, with its enormous up-front costs, will only worsen the underfunding problem—not just for BRAC but for defense overall.

Mr. Chairman, we are also told that without a 1995 round readiness and modernization will suffer. The fact is, as Defense News reported 2 weeks ago, escalating BRAC costs threaten to "overwhelm current budget plans, and could force the Pentagon to delay base closures or rob readiness funds."

The services may argue that a 1995 round is crucial to maintaining readiness and modernization. The reality is that the services have not seen any net real savings to date and with a 1995 BRAC they will not see any until the next century.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not kill the BRAC process. This amendment does not alter the role of the non-partisan commission. It does, however, provide for a 2-year pause so the defense budget can catch up with the enormous up-front cost of base closures and realignments and communities can catch up with needed economic adjustment.

This amendment would allow us to ensure that the drawdown is accomplished in a prudent and reasonable fiscal and military fashion. To do otherwise would, in the end, cheat the taxpayer and harm the Nation's defense.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hansen amendment. I think it makes a lot of sense. Base closure has not worked as expected. It is costing too much to clean up and close the bases. We are having to take monies away from readiness. We are only asking for a 2-year delay to let Defense Department get caught up. The Base Closure Commission has done an outstanding job. They are not the problem in any way. I hope the Commission will continue to operate in the excellent manner they have done in 1989, 1991-93.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the committee.

□ 1350

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. First of all, Mr. Chairman, let us have a history lesson. Why do we have the base realignment and closure process at all? The reason is that for years and years, this Congress refused to allow the Pentagon to do what was in the national defense and security interests of this country, and instead put parochial pork-barrel interests ahead of national defense interests and prevented the Defense Department from doing what needed to be done and close obsolete military bases. So we created an inde-

pendent base closing process, a process that has been difficult, has been painful, and has created lots of problems across this country. But it has worked in its objective of providing for this country's national defense first, and making those concerns the priority of any decision about closing military bases.

At issue today with this amendment is will we move forward, or will we move backward in those old days of allowing Congress and parochial pork-barrel politics to veto what is in the national defense interests of this country? Will we do today what is politically expedient, or will we do today what is the right thing to do? Defense decisions, Mr. Chairman, will they be based on the national security and defense of this country, or will they be based on the short-term political interests of Members of Congress?

What is in the interest of national defense? Well, the Secretary of Defense has told us what is in the interests of national defense, Mr. Chairman. I am going to quote from a letter that we wrote:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the civilian leadership of the Department of Defense strongly oppose the Hansen amendment. We believe that the infrastructure savings that will be achieved by base realignment and closure are essential to maintaining the readiness of our forces in the next century. Deferring this process put readiness at risk.

I would like to close by saying, for every Member of Congress who is feeling concerned and feeling the pressure at home because they may have a base in their district that might face closing in the next round, I would like to quote the Senator from Maine, Margaret Chase Smith, who was faced with a similar dilemma when she served in the U.S. Senate. I am going to paraphrase from a speech she gave on March 30, 1961.

Mr. President, this morning at 9 o'clock I received from the Department of the Air Force notification that it had been decided to close the Snark Missile Base at Presque Isle, ME. The far easier course for me to pursue politically would be to vigorously protest this action and, as a Republican Senator, to point out that the decision was one made by a Democratic President and to make political attack on the decision of President Kennedy. The far easier course for me to pursue politically would be to demand that the Presque Isle Air Force Base be kept operating to aid the economy of the area and to avoid the impact and dislocation that its closing is bound to have on the economy of this area. But in all good conscience, I cannot do this, for this would simply be playing politics with our national security, our national defense, and our taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Chairman, let us heed the words of Senator Margaret Chase Smith. Let us not play politics with our national

security and national defense. Let us do the difficult thing, but the right thing, and vote down this shortsighted amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the moral tone of the debate by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS] here. But with all due respect, I think there are other considerations, other than alleged pork-barrel morals in regards to the amendment now being considered, and that is our national security, which is a changing situation.

We just heard a debate in the House by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], that perhaps we ought to take a stronger stand in reference to Bosnia. It was last spring that I attended a briefing, and the administration was ready to send 60,000 troops to Bosnia. Our allies said no. We do not know whether or not we are going to have an invasion in Haiti or not. We have those military exercises now ongoing. We do not know what is going to happen in regards to North Korea. There are 37,500 good reasons why we should stop and take a look. That is the number of American men and women in uniform over there. We do not know what is going to happen with the former Soviet Union. We do not know what is going to happen in regards to the Mideast.

There is no consistency or predictability in the new world order, or the new world disorder. Moreover, there is very little predictability and consistency in regards to the administration's conduct of foreign policy.

I say support the gentleman's amendment because of national security. Base closing is, in fact, robbing our readiness funds. I thank the gentleman for introducing the amendment.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues, we need this debate. I come from one of the most heavily affected areas of the base closing process. Philadelphia is right now losing 20,000 jobs from the closure of the Philadelphia Naval Base and the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

But, Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, we told our colleagues years ago the savings would not be what they were projected in terms of base closing. We told them environmental costs would be higher than in fact they were projected to be, and we told them there would be a terrible local impact.

Although as I do not like where we are, we are here. We are cutting de-

fense dramatically. To do that, we have to continue to downsize the size of our installations. The height of hypocrisy, Mr. Chairman, would be for those colleagues of ours who support cutting defense to also vote for this amendment to prolong the base closing process.

This process must continue as we downsize the military far beyond what I think is right. We must also allow the Pentagon to take the steps to close appropriate facilities.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hansen amendment to defer the base closure scheduled for 1995 until 1997. The Department of Defense has found that base closure is a time-consuming and costly endeavor and I urge my colleagues not to act in haste to complete a process for which this Government is not prepared.

The 1988, 1991, and 1993 rounds of base closures have revealed a far greater amount of environmental cleanup than had been expected. The Department of Defense has not completed any of these closure rounds 1993.

The first three rounds of base closures is estimated to cost the Federal Government \$17.3 billion, with only \$2.6 billion having been expended and we still have a lot of work to do on them.

Base closures have a devastating impact on communities, we should not rush to impose that difficulty on the people who have served our Nation when she needed them.

Base closure means jobs lost. When times are tough, people are out of work, why take away more people's jobs? When people don't work, Uncle Sam pays.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Hansen amendment and delay the 1995 BRAC for 2 years.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hansen amendment. I do so reluctantly, because I feel as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] does, the hot breath of the BRAC. But I think we have to stay the course.

In 1991, Congress put in place a process to ensure that base closures went forward on schedule to reflect reductions being made elsewhere in the Department of Defense. To date, we have reduced our armed services by 30 percent, but we have only reduced the infrastructure by half that much. We cannot afford to maintain an oversized base structure, lest we compromise the personnel, training, and equipment needs that are at the core of our readiness requirements.

The BRAC process affords us the only opportunity to downsize the military

infrastructure to ensure that we maintain a proper balance in the makeup of our military forces.

I recognize the desire of a number of our colleagues to postpone base closures because their own base may be considered for closure. I understand this feeling, as I said, very well. My district has already been hit hard by two major base closures, and with the '95 BRAC, we continue to live under the threat of our largest closure yet, which in itself would affect 15,000 direct jobs. If anyone has a concern about BRAC, it is me.

Even with this concern, however, I firmly believe that BRAC '95 must go forward. We cannot afford to forego the significant savings that may result from the '95 round. Secretary Perry indicates we will save 4 to 5 million per year by the end of this decade from previous BRAC rounds. This is the bottom line we should all support.

I might also say that we do have the opportunity, I think, to have a much lesser round than some have prophesied. I do not see this, as has been described, as a base closure round to be called the mother of all base closure rounds. Secretary Perry has indicated, and so has Assistant Secretary Deutch, that it will probably be a smaller round, one that will have less budget impact.

I fully expect we will be asked to have further rounds beyond '95. But the Pentagon opposes this amendment, and I oppose it and urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment as well.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the Hansen amendment to the Defense authorization bill, which would defer the next round of base closing until 1997.

I support this initiative because I am extremely concerned about the status of base closures and realignments ordained by previous base closure commissions. We have now gone through three rounds of base closure, and the result has been huge budget and schedule problems with those facilities designated for closure or realignment. As of this date we have completed only 46 of the 147 base closures prescribed by the previous BRAC commissions, or 31 percent of the total. On realignments, the figures are even worse: only 6 percent—6 of 100—have been completed.

Meanwhile, the Pentagon has indicated that it will take some \$17.3 billion to meet only the most basic closure and realignment costs. To date, however, only \$2.6 billion has been expended. And while the costs of closure have been rising, the expected revenues and savings from base closure have been declining. Environmental remediation costs in particular have been miscalculated, with current projections indicating that the costs of such work have been underestimated by some 60 percent.

As a consequence of the serious underfunding of past BRAC directives, the services have been left with no choice but to address immediate requirements and meet fixed timeliness by robbing their readiness accounts, decreasing the amount of money available for the services' training, operations and maintenance. Combined with budget cuts being imposed on the services, we have reached a point where our military's capabilities are directly threatened.

In my view we need to take pause for a short period to allow us to address our existing base closure and realignment requirements, to catch up in terms of budget and schedule problems, and to make sure that our military services are able to provide for our national security interests without having to raid readiness accounts. I urge my colleagues to support the Hansen amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

□ 1400

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah to defer the 1995 round of base closures until 1997.

In the fog of confusion which surrounds BRAC, it is time to take a step back and assess where we are before proceeding with the final round in 1997.

As it stands now, the base closure process is significantly underfunded. The cost of closing and realigning bases is increasing while BRAC savings are not being realized on schedule, if at all. Not one of the previous three rounds of base closings have been completed. Less than 20 percent of all closures and realignments undertaken since 1988 have been completed. Only 46 of the 147 bases that are supposed to close have actually been closed—and not one of them has been completely cleaned up environmentally.

Meanwhile, the cost of BRAC continues to increase well beyond any estimates provided by DOD. The General Accounting Office has found that the costs of environmental cleanup are significantly higher than expected and that revenues from land sales are significantly less than expected. The effect of both has been to erode any net savings to date.

DOD now believes that net real savings from the first three BRAC rounds alone will not be seen until fiscal year 1997. Given how far off DOD has been in its own estimates to date, the 1997 estimate is probably very optimistic. But, one thing is certainly true. No real savings from base closure—whether the next round is in 1995 or 1997—will be seen until sometime next century.

Given the huge base backlog, why is there a rush to complete BRAC in 1995? There is only one reason to proceed without taking the time to seriously examine the issue, and that reason is to allow the military services to rec-

commend closing as many bases as possible in order to demonstrate paper savings necessary to meet impossibly low Clinton defense spending numbers. The driving force behind the base closure process is no longer to cut bases in an effort to reduce unneeded infrastructure, it is to cut bases in order to cut the defense budget.

This is wrong. It is poor budget policy and it is even worse military planning. Right now, no one is able to provide any clear assessment of the military implications of BRAC. The Armed Services Committee has admitted as much by including a provision in the bill, section 2815, which would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by January 1, 1995, on the effect of base closures on future mobilization options.

While such a report would be very useful, it is long overdue. It makes no sense, however, to require a report on the military effects of BRAC while in the midst of the final base closing round and proceed as if that report did not exist.

We need time to consider the administration's report. We need a comprehensive assessment of the overall costs of base closures. We need reliable information on the true costs and schedule of environmental restoration. We need to understand the economic implications of recent changes to the policy by which excess Federal land and property will be disposed. Without detailed answers to the nagging questions surrounding BRAC, we are flying blind.

Only the adoption of the Hansen amendment will give us the time to fully understand the economic and military implications of BRAC. We are not calling for an end to BRAC. We are calling for a pause. To do otherwise risks the loss of infrastructure that will never be replaced.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Hansen amendment.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the delay of the 1995 BRAC. At a time of downsizing the U.S. military, the only time we can come together with a force structure to meet our national security objectives is through jointness, colocation and mutuality of support. Trying to get the Pentagon to think that way is very, very difficult.

To my colleagues, I have Grisson Air Force Base in my district. It was closed under the 1991 BRAC, realigned to a reserve base, a single-mission base to handle 60 KC-135's. I have excess capacity there for 40.

In the infinite wisdom of the Pentagon, less than 50 miles away they have now chosen to spend \$41 million to duplicate a Grisson Air Force Base for 8 to 10 KC-135's by the Guard Bureau.

That is an incredible decision by the Pentagon. That is an inequity that is occurring throughout the United States.

We have to allow the BRAC process to continue forward in order to cure the inequities that are occurring out there. To those generals in the Pentagon that are listening right now, you can no longer have your own sand boxes with your own set of toys.

We have to move to jointness, mutuality of support, colocation to come up with a force structure necessary to meet national security objectives. Vote this amendment down.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

I might say right off the bat that I worked very closely with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] in the early days of passing base closure legislation. In fact, I warned the year before it passed that either it was going to be done rationally through the committee or it would be done on the floor.

We, in fact, did pass base closure, and I was proud to have played a part in it.

It has been, obviously, a very painful process for many Members. There have been some winners but a heck of a lot more losers. Most of the Members in this body have been touched by the loss of jobs and the hurt that ultimately evolves to families in this whole base closure deal.

What I will tell Members is that the process, the supreme part of this process, it has been a nonpolitical, one of the most apolitical, nonpolitical operations that I have ever observed on Capitol Hill.

One of the things that I believe the communities have been able to take great solace in is the fact is that the Commission has called them like they have seen them, and they have made the hard choices. And people across this country have learned to accept that when the decisions are made, the decisions get made properly.

I do not know what we tell Members who have had bases closed up till this point, whose people have gone along with it in a great American spirit, and tell them now we are going to exempt a lot of other Members out in the future.

Look, we have to keep the process correct. We must keep it nonpolitical. We must downsize the overhead of the Pentagon in order to provide for readiness, the kind of readiness that we need to conduct tough military operations.

This is a tough vote for Members. What I want to say to them, is, think it out. Let us keep the train on the track and let us do it so that everybody gets the sense of fairness that

every community in this country deserves. Vote no on the amendment.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

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

I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Utah. The gentleman makes a very important point in bringing out this debate. But it does seem to me that having made the decision some years ago to go with the Armeey amendment which brought us this base closure process and having seen that base closure process work as it has under Chairman Courter, with a great deal of objectivity, not without pain to those of us who have been realigned and possibly closed, but with objectivity, I think to veer away from that at this point would be a mistake, because we may then inject this question back into the pre-Armeey setting.

I do not think that would be useful. I believe at this point the gentleman's amendment ought not to be passed. We ought to proceed with the regular BRAC process.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY] has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY] would have the right to close.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the author of the original provision on base closure.

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

My colleagues in the Chamber will notice that I have taken an unaccustomed position in the well. I do that to dramatize a point. The point is, base closing, since BRAC '88, has not been and is not today a partisan political issue.

In fact, the one thing I think we in this House can feel proud about is that partisan politics has not entered into the process either in this Chamber or in the deliberations of the Commission. The nonpartisan implementation of a truly bipartisan legislative effort is a rare experience indeed.

I would like to also express my appreciation to the gentleman who offered this amendment, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] in particular. I understand this is offered for the best of all intentions. I only reluctantly speak against the amendment.

The fact of the matter is, keeping bases open 2 more years will cost \$9 billion. The Defense Department, on May 20, said, "Delaying the base closure process until 1997 would deny the De-

fense Department up to \$9 billion in annual recurring savings resulting from the lost 2-year period."

Wasting that \$9 billion will hurt our military readiness. The base closure process is not underfunded.

According to the DOD's May 20 letter, "The claim that the base closure process is 'seriously underfunded' is without basis."

The military construction bill we just passed increases funding for base closures by 23 percent over last year. A vote against the Hansen amendment is a vote for good government.

The Secretary of Defense opposes it, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff opposes it, the National Taxpayers Union opposes it. Citizens Against Government Waste oppose it. The New York Times opposes it. The Washington Times opposes it. The chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services oppose it. Millions of American taxpayers oppose it.

I ask the Members of this body, please vote "no" and do so out of all respect for the author of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following information.

DOD POLICY ON THE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE PROCESS

Secretary of Defense William J. Perry and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General John Shalikashvili jointly issued the following statement on 1995 base closures:

"We will conduct the 1995 round of base closures. The prudent management of our resources demands it. As in the past, the number and types of facilities recommended for closure will depend on our force structure needs. We shall also consider the cumulative economic impact on communities as well as our capacity to responsibly manage re-use of closed facilities. We must proceed to close bases in order to save money, managing the process in a way that recognizes that base closing costs money before it saves money. Too much, too soon jeopardizes our current program; too little, too late jeopardizes our future program. These are the considerations that will determine the size and shape of the closings we will recommend to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission for 1995. If closures beyond the amount we can responsibly accomplish in 1995 are required or force structure requirements change, we will seek authority for future BRAC rounds."

POTENTIAL AMENDMENT TO DELAY BRAC 95

Background: A "Dear Colleague" letter from Congressmen Floyd Spence and James Hansen solicits support for an amendment they intend to introduce to defer the 1995 BRAC round until 1997.

DoD Position: The Department is strongly opposed to such an amendment. The "Dear Colleague" letter's acknowledgement that DoD cannot continue to maintain its Cold War infrastructure negates the letter's further assertion that deferral of the BRAC 95 process makes both economic and military sense.

Delaying the BRAC 95 process two years until 1997 would deny the Department up to \$9.0 billion in annual recurring savings resulting from the lost two year period, which would severely impact readiness. Also, do-

mestic base closures are lagging way behind force structure reductions. If this situation is allowed to continue, or is exacerbated by a delay in the BRAC 95 process, the Department could find itself in the position of maintaining military installations for which there are no longer military missions. The maintenance of unnecessary infrastructure is unsound policy both economically and militarily.

The letter's claim that the BRAC process is seriously underfunded is without basis. The recent Congressional rescission of \$507 million in BRAC 93 appropriations does have the potential to delay some base closure schedules, but it would be misleading to hold this up as an example of the BRAC process being "seriously underfunded". The Department and the Congress, with the exception of the recent rescission, have fully funded necessary BRAC costs which are offset by BRAC savings that are realized during implementation.

The cited increase in environmental cleanup cost estimates does not support delaying the BRAC 95 process. The Department has experienced environmental cost increases at active military bases also. Environmental cleanup cost increases are for the most part a function of improving technology; both for identification of environmental hazards and techniques to mitigate or eliminate them. Regardless, delaying the BRAC 95 process would not reduce environmental cleanup costs as the Department is obligated by law to cleanup its bases, closing or not.

The letter also cites a report that criticizes the Department for disposition actions that had the "*** potential for large monetary losses ***" related to the transfer of a medical facility and perishable supplies to the Bureau of Prisons. The report misses the point that another Federal agency (Bureau of Prisons) benefited from this transfer, that perishable supplies will be put to their intended use and, most importantly, that the local community supported and welcomed this transfer and the attendant influx of jobs. This action by the Department is in complete accordance with the wishes of the President as expressed in his Five-Part Program to speed economic recovery in communities adversely affected by base closures.

It is an undeniable fact that the Department must close more military installations. Delaying the BRAC 95 process will add unnecessary costs, forgo considerable savings and delay the ultimate economic recovery of the affected communities. We urge the Congress to not support efforts to delay the BRAC 95 process.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE, Washington, DC, May 20, 1994.

Hon. DICK ARMEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR DICK: On behalf of the 600,000 members of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), thank you for your efforts on the fiscal year 95 Defense Authorization Act, H.R. 4301.

As the founder of the Military Base Closing Coalition in 1988, when your bill to establish the Base Closure and Realignment Commission was first enacted by Congress, CCAGW fully supports the effort to block any attempt to postpone the 1995 round of base closing recommendations. This is not the time to repoliticize military base closures or return to parochial politics. More importantly, at a time when our Armed Forces are being asked to drastically reduce non-essential spending, sparing obsolete bases

would come at the expense of the nation's military readiness.

Some members of the Congress feel the defense budget simply absorb the up-front costs of the 1995 round. This statement is simply not true. The *New York Times* reported on May 5 that Admiral Jeremy Boorda, the new Chief of Naval Operations said, "We really need this (1995 round). There's not enough money to maintain infrastructure we no longer need."

On May 11, 1994, Secretary of Defense William J. Perry and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General John Shalikashvili jointly issued the following statement on 1995 base closures:

"We will conduct the 1995 round of base closures. The prudent management of our resources demands it. As in the past, the number and types of facilities recommended for closure will depend on our force structure needs. We must proceed to close bases in order to save money, managing the process in a way that recognizes that base closing costs money before it saves money. These are the considerations that will determine the size and shape of the closings we will recommend to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission for 1995."

CCAGW strongly urges the House of Representatives to fight any attempt to postpone the 1995 round until 1997. This vote will be considered in our 1994 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

TOM.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,

Washington, DC, May 18, 1994.

Hon. DICK ARMEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ARMEY: The 250,000-member National Taxpayer Union opposes any legislation that would delay the 1995 round of military base closings, and supports your effort to prevent such a delay.

Thanks in no small part to your tireless dedication, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission was formed in 1988 to address Congress' lack of will to close individual military facilities located in members' districts. The National Taxpayers Union actively campaigned for this important reform.

By 1991, the Commission had already closed or realigned 82 bases, for a total budget savings of \$1.5 billion annually. More than 150 industrial parks, municipal airports, and educational establishments have already been created from closed bases, resulting in a net gain of more than 60,000 civilian jobs. The latest round of base closings, approved by Congress last year, could save taxpayers more than \$3 billion annually over five years.

In short, the military base closure process created seven years ago has been a resounding political and economic success. Any attempt in this Congress to delay the process only invites a return to the partisan bickering, pork-barrel politics, and unacceptable taxpayer burdens that once marred the debate over closing obsolete military bases. Overburdened taxpayers should not, and need not, be treated to such a sorry spectacle.

Accordingly, the National Taxpayers Union strongly opposes an amendment offered by Rep. Hansen (R-UT) to postpone the 1995 round of base closures to 1997. NTU would also strongly oppose any other attempts to delay, alter, or repeal the content or schedule of the 1995 round of base closings. A "NO" vote on the Hansen Amendment, or any other amendment to delay or alter the 1995 base

closing schedule, will be included in NTU's annual Rating of Congress as a pro-tarpayer vote. Sincerely,

AL CORS, Jr.,
Director, Government Relations.

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1994]

KEEPING POLITICS OUT OF BASE CLOSINGS

Congress removed politics from the painful process of closing military bases in 1988 by giving the central role to an independent commission. It was a smart move. In the preceding decade, bluster by the Pentagon and politicking by members of Congress had prevented any closings at all. But since then, more than 200 large and small bases have been tagged for closing, and 24 of them are already closed. When they are all closed, the savings will exceed \$4 billion a year.

The Supreme court ruled yesterday that the Federal Government's choice of which bases to close is not subject to challenge in court, thus foreclosing efforts by some states to save facilities in their areas. But the carefully constructed process is now threatened in Congress. A proposal to tinker with it has support in the House, and will be offered this week as an amendment to the defense authorization bill. Its passage would be a mistake.

Representative Dick Armey, a Texas Republican, devised the process under which an independent commission reviews a list of bases the Pentagon proposes to close or restructure. Starting from the Pentagon's list, and after hearing arguments pro and con, the commission draws up its own list. That list goes to the Secretary of Defense, then the President and finally both houses of Congress; any of them may kill the entire list, but they may not pick and choose among the candidates for elimination. No list has yet been rejected.

The first commission worked so well that Congress voted in 1990 to repeat the process in odd-numbered years through 1995—avoiding the unpleasantness of closings in election years. The 1991 and 1993 rounds are history, but the 1995 round has some politicians nervous. The Pentagon is expected to submit a long list, because this would be its last chance under the current law.

A bill co-sponsored by Representatives James Hansen of Utah and Floyd Spence of South Carolina, both Republicans, would postpone the 1995 round to 1997. The Pentagon estimates that this would waste \$9 billion. The Administration opposes this bill, but is toying with the idea of letting the 1995 round proceed, then adding another in 1997. This, too, would reduce closings in 1995, on the eve of the 1996 Presidential election.

Military leaders oppose any stretch-out, because it makes them spend money on bases they do not want instead of weapons they need. Congress made the right decision in 1988, and reaffirmed it in 1991. Any fiddling puts the whole process at risk.

[From the Washington Times, May 24, 1994]

LET THE BASES CLOSE

The House may vote as soon as today on a proposal to delay the fourth and final round of military base closings from 1995, as scheduled, to 1997. Delay would be a major and costly mistake.

The political popularity of military bases on Capitol Hill is legendary. To create even the possibility of closing bases that are no longer militarily necessary, Congress adopted a proposal by Rep. Dick Armey to eliminate political horse-trading from the process. A commission would draft a list, and

with the approval of the administration and the Congress of the list as a whole—on an up-or-down vote in which the list is not subject to revision—obsolete bases would finally close. The process has worked well three times, to the benefit of taxpayers and the military itself, which need not allocate resources to useless institutions.

Comes now Rep. Ron Hansen, Republican of Utah, to suggest a two-year delay in the final cycle. Numerous arguments for delay are making the rounds. Some of them are more disingenuous than others. One suggests, absurdly, that base closing is "underfunded" in Pentagon budgets—that is, that the Pentagon does not have the money to save money. It's true that it costs money to shut down a military base. But if Congress is serious about making necessary closures, that is money that is going to have to be spent one day. Delay merely compounds the cost by the amount it takes to keep unnecessary bases open in the interim. The Pentagon reckons the long-term costs of the Hansen amendment at \$9 billion. The secretary of defense and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff both want this round of closings to go forward.

Congress did the right thing by agreeing in 1988 to a formula that would, at long last, shut obsolete bases down. The House shouldn't lose its nerve on the eve of the successful conclusion of this process. Although some legislators fear the negative economic effect, and thus the electoral consequences, of a closure in their district, delay now would have grave consequences as well. It would be an indication that Congress is incapable of real fiscal discipline. People are worried about that as well, and members of Congress need to understand that risk to their careers as well.

□ 1410

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for offering this amendment. To those who suggest there is not politics on the Base Closing Commission process, they are sadly mistaken. Unfortunately, we in Maine were targeted by the Base Closing Commission, and we felt the heavyhandedness of Pentagon politics when it targeted Loring Air Force Base for closure on the basis of quality of life, and not on the issues concerning military value, because that decision was driven by the Pentagon.

For those who suggest that somehow this is an underfunded process, they are not looking at the facts. That is what this amendment is all about.

I want to congratulate the gentleman because he is forcing us to look at the issues, and not to bury our heads in the proverbial sand. If we look at the facts, it is a clarion call for supporting this amendment.

First of all, not one base closure round has been completed since 1988. That is 6 years ago. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that they have underestimated the BRAC-related environmental cleanup costs by more than 60 percent.

We have also, in the State of Maine, the environmental cleanup associated with Loring Air Force Base. This year we are appropriating \$265 million. Do Members know what the Congressional Budget Office is saying we are going to need on an annual basis for the next 5 years? Four billion dollars, so we have underestimated environmental cleanup by more than \$20 billion.

The cost is to whom? The cost is to the defense and to the national security interests, by taking this money out of modernization and readiness, because we have underestimated the costs and overestimated the savings.

Finally, it is going to affect the communities and the personnel that will be directly affected by base closing processes, because we have hardly begun to address our responsibility in defense conversion activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are not keeping bases open for 2 more years, as my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] said. We are trying to close them. BRAC 1993 is not funded. The military right now is funded in 1994 at a bone marrow minimum. All the funding for 1995 and out is based on closing those bases, but yet this administration and this body will not even fund BRAC 1993.

NTC closed, but yet the skipper had to just put out a check for \$30,000 out of training money because this body will not fund BRAC 1993. Now we are going to dump BRAC 1995 on top of that? Our communities that we are talking about, the military is going to have to take this out of hide, and it is going to kill defense.

I think it is purposeful, and I think that the liberal leadership on the other side is attempting to do this to kill defense. They kill it with \$127 billion defense cuts, they put peacekeeping in it, they do not fund BRAC, and then they dump BRAC 1995 on top of that, and they are killing the military.

Mr. Chairman, let us support the amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, there is another side to this BRAC debate. I might note that my colleague and I, and the gentleman from San Diego, have fared well under BRAC. We have gained about 7,000 jobs, and the parochial vote in San Diego is to support BRAC and try to get Long Beach closed down, which would bring another several thousand jobs to San Diego, but there are some long-range questions about BRAC that I have asked over and

over again in our committee hearings that the chairman and I have held, that DOD has not been forthcoming on.

One of those questions is, is there a long-range mobilization plan that fits in with BRAC? Is there a deep thinker in the Pentagon who has looked at what it is going to take in terms of military structure to meet a mobilization requirement, because once we give away air space, once we give away coastline, we cannot retrieve that.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the answers that I have gotten in briefings have been one-liners. They have not been intellectual, they have not been in depth, and I have come to the conclusion that there is not a long-range deep thinker who has decided when this project comes to closure.

Additionally, we have created an environmental monster that has taken \$30 billion out of DOD since 1988. That money has come out of readiness. We should flesh out the first three rounds of BRAC and then move forward.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been an interesting debate. I appreciate both sides talking about this very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this 90-percent figure that my friend, the gentleman from Texas, talked about is funding the request, not the cost. If people will really take a look at this, no one has addressed the cost of closing these bases.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] just pointed out, we have a huge backlog. I ask the Members to call their base commanders, do not take my word for it. They are going to have 15 minutes or so. Give him a call and ask him. I can guarantee what he is going to say. He is going to say, "I am taking the money from O&M, I am taking away readiness, I am taking away training, because the Pentagon is not giving me the money." That is the reality of this thing.

If we want to tear the military down this way, by all means, let us go pell-mell into 1995, take this huge backlog we have from 1988, from 1991, from 1993, and dump it right on top of them.

Does that make any sense to anybody? Three lessons on how to kill the military. We did it after the First World War, the Second World War, and we win one over in the Persian Gulf and we want to tear it down again.

Where do people believe it is all safe in the world? Can anybody in this hall, anybody over in that five-sided building over there, tell me where we are going in America? I do not know where we are going.

The Director of the CIA says there are 50 poison snakes out there. I would urge Members to take a close look at this and let us keep our military solvent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] has 4 minutes remaining to close debate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hansen amendment, which would delay the last authorized base closure round from 1995 to 1997. It defies logic to offer an amendment which would so directly affect and decrement our readiness of our forces.

Nobody has ever claimed that base closure would be easy. That is why Congress passed legislation which created the Base Closure and Realignment Commission in the first place. Passage of this amendment would show a complete lack of political courage and would tell an already skeptical Nation that Congress cannot keep its commitment to this process. The House spoke when we passed comprehensive base closure legislation and should not be second guessed at this point.

Mr. Chairman, nobody has ever claimed that this legislation would be perfect or that it would bring about immediate savings, particularly in the area of proceeds anticipated from land sales. The reality is that we're not going to achieve revenue from sale of facilities and land as long as we give these properties to communities to mitigate the impact of a closure. Nonetheless, DOD still forecasts steadily increasing annual savings figures beginning in fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, we have known from the outset that this process would have up-front costs. It will cost money to implement decisions made by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission to realign forces as installations in fact close. The Congress has been supportive of these efforts, fully funding the base closure accounts to ensure that we are good stewards of the BRAC's recommendations.

If this amendment passes, it sends a signal to our military leadership that we are not committed to achieve the readiness levels so greatly needed in preparing to meet the threats and challenges facing our forces today and in the future. Keeping unneeded infrastructure begs the question, "for whose benefit?" Do we keep unnecessary installations for short-term political gain or do we let the process continue as authorized so that the military can get the most efficient use of declining resources?

If I believed that the defense budget would again reach its 1985 peak, I too would question the legitimacy of conducting the next closure round. But reality tells us otherwise. Delay of the next round will ultimately force our military leadership to cut readiness accounts to keep the lights on at installations that do not have a mission. If we vote for this, I seriously doubt we will be able to afford any modernization of our equipment and forces. Even if we keep forces at a level to meet the Bottom Up Review requirements, we run the risk of a 30 percent shortfall in

acquiring systems to replace rapidly aging forces.

□ 1420

Furthermore, all over the country both strong and vulnerable installations would experience reductions in force of civilian personnel just to sustain unneeded infrastructure. In that scenario, all military installations and their neighboring communities around the country would lose. We already face a \$14.5 billion backlog on maintenance and repair of real property in the system today. And in the end, we would still face the inevitable closure of unneeded military bases.

Mr. Chairman, last year Congress passed legislation to assist communities affected by base closure. Its ultimate aim is to ensure that the closing base can act as an economic engine, not a burden, for local communities. Public benefit conveyance is but one avenue that provides this opportunity for impacted communities. No longer can it be said that the base closure is simply chaining the gates and walking away.

Unfortunately, the proponents of this amendment are creating even more dire circumstances than they assumed. The department will use fast paying accounts to continue to breathe life into installations that have no mission and unduly impact the readiness of our forces.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the Hansen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that he was in doubt.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 68, noes 362, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—68

Andrews (NJ)	Hayes	Ravenel
Applegate	Hefley	Roberts
Bartlett	Huffington	Sarpalius
Blackwell	Hughes	Saxton
Boehlert	Hunter	Schenk
Burton	Jacobs	Shepherd
Calvert	Kim	Shuster
Canady	Lancaster	Skeen
Chapman	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Clinger	Livingston	Snowe
Coble	McCollum	Spence
Combest	McDade	Stearns
Cunningham	McKeon	Stump
DeLay	Meyers	Swett
Farr	Mica	Taylor (MS)
Filner	Mink	Tejeda
Foglietta	Molinari	Torkildsen
Fowler	Montgomery	Trafficant
Galleghy	Murtha	Tucker
Gallo	Myers	Williams
Gejdenson	Orton	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	Pallone	Zeliff
Hansen	Parker	

NOES—362

Abercrombie	Engel	LaRocco
Ackerman	English	Laughlin
Allard	Eshoo	Lazio
Andrews (ME)	Evans	Leach
Andrews (TX)	Everett	Lehman
Archer	Ewing	Levin
Arney	Faleomavaega	Levy
Bacchus (FL)	(AS)	Lewis (FL)
Bacchus (AL)	Fawell	Lewis (GA)
Baesler	Fazio	Lightfoot
Baker (CA)	Fields (LA)	Linder
Baker (LA)	Fields (TX)	Lipinski
Ballenger	Fingerhut	Lloyd
Barca	Fish	Long
Barcia	Flake	Lowey
Barrett (NE)	Ford (MI)	Lucas
Barton	Ford (TN)	Machtley
Bateman	Frank (MA)	Maloney
Becerra	Franks (CT)	Mann
Beilenson	Franks (NJ)	Manton
Bentley	Frost	Manzullo
Bereuter	Furse	Margolies-
Berman	Gekas	Mezvinsky
Bevill	Gephardt	Markey
Bilbray	Geren	Martinez
Bilirakis	Gibbons	Mazzoli
Bishop	Gilchrest	McCandless
Bliley	Gillmor	McCloskey
Blute	Gilman	McCrery
Boehner	Gingrich	McCurdy
Bonilla	Glickman	McDermott
Bonior	Goodlatte	McHale
Borski	Goodling	McHugh
Boucher	Gordon	McInnis
Brewster	Goss	McKinney
Brooks	Grams	McMillan
Browder	Green	McNulty
Brown (CA)	Greenwood	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Gunderson	Meek
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	Menendez
Bryant	Hall (OH)	Mfume
Bunning	Hall (TX)	Michel
Buyer	Hamburg	Miller (CA)
Byrne	Hamilton	Miller (FL)
Callahan	Hancock	Mineta
Camp	Harman	Minge
Cantwell	Hastert	Moakley
Cardin	Hastings	Mollohan
Carr	Hefner	Moorhead
Castle	Herger	Moran
Clay	Hilliard	Morella
Clayton	Hinchey	Murphy
Clement	Hoagland	Nadler
Clyburn	Hobson	Neal (MA)
Coleman	Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)
Collins (GA)	Hoekstra	Norton (DC)
Collins (IL)	Hoke	Nussle
Collins (MI)	Holden	Oberstar
Condit	Houghton	Obey
Conyers	Hoyer	Oliver
Cooper	Hutchinson	Owens
Coppersmith	Hutto	Oxley
Costello	Hyde	Packard
Cox	Inglis	Pastor
Coyne	Inhofe	Paxon
Cramer	Inslee	Payne (NJ)
Crane	Istook	Payne (VA)
Crapo	Jefferson	Pelosi
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Penny
Darden	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)
de Lugo (VI)	Johnson, E. B.	Petri
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Pickett
DeFazio	Johnston	Pickle
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pombo
Dellums	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Derrick	Kasich	Porter
Deutsch	Kennedy	Portman
Diaz-Balart	Kennelly	Poshard
Dickey	Kildee	Price (NC)
Dicks	King	Pryce (OH)
Dingell	Kingston	Quillen
Dixon	Klecza	Quinn
Dooley	Klein	Rahall
Doolittle	Klink	Ramstad
Dorman	Klug	Rangel
Dreier	Knollenberg	Reed
Duncan	Kolbe	Regula
Dunn	Kopetski	Reynolds
Durbin	Kreidler	Richardson
Edwards (CA)	Kyl	Ridge
Edwards (TX)	LaFalce	Roemer
Ehlers	Lambert	Rogers
Emerson	Lantos	Rohrabacher

Romero-Barcelo	Skelton	Torricelli
(PR)	Slattery	Towns
Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Underwood (GU)
Rose	Smith (IA)	Unsoeld
Rostenkowski	Smith (MI)	Upton
Roth	Smith (OR)	Valentine
Roukema	Smith (TX)	Velazquez
Rowland	Solomon	Vento
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Visclosky
Royce	Stark	Volkmer
Rush	Stenholm	Vucanovich
Sabo	Stokes	Walker
Sanders	Strickland	Walsh
Sangmeister	Studds	Waters
Santorum	Stupak	Watt
Sawyer	Sundquist	Waxman
Schaefer	Swift	Weldon
Schiff	Synar	Wheat
Schroeder	Talent	Wilson
Schumer	Tanner	Wise
Scott	Tauzin	Wolf
Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	Woolsey
Serrano	Thomas (CA)	Wyden
Sharp	Thomas (WY)	Wynn
Shaw	Thompson	Yates
Shays	Thornton	Young (FL)
Sisisky	Thurman	Zimmer
Skaggs	Torres	

NOT VOTING—8

Barlow	Horn	Washington
Barrett (WI)	Matsui	Whitten
Grandy	Ortiz	

□ 1448

Messrs. INHOFE, STRICKLAND, and BEVILL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KIM changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOLLOHAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. MAZZOLI, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1450

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION TO NEXT CONSIDER PROCEEDINGS CONTEMPLATED BY SECTION 3(e) OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 431

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House next resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of H.R. 4301, the Committee proceed to the consideration of the proceedings contemplated by section 3(e) of House Resolution 431.

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

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so in order to ask a couple of questions of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

It is my understanding that the unanimous consent propounded by the gentleman from California would, in fact, allow the House to proceed in the next few minutes with the C-17 debate.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct in the first instance.

Mr. WALKER. We are concerned then with the schedule following that. We would certainly be in agreement that it is reasonable to do that at this point.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield to me, I would be happy to explain as I am sure the gentlemen on that side of the aisle are very concerned that before the House adjourns this evening that two important issues are debated and acted upon. One instance relates to Haiti, and the second relates to peacekeeping.

Mr. Speaker, I have given the gentleman my assurances that this gentleman would not move that the Committee rise until such time as the body has acted upon not only the C-17, but peacekeeping and Haiti.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that. The gentleman is correct that that is a concern on our side, and it is my understanding that this is something which the gentleman has discussed with leadership, that he is not going to run into leadership problems later on his side with regard to those two issues.

Is that correct?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has my word on that.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 431 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4301).

□ 1453

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for

fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, with Mr. MAZZOLI, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] printed in part 2 of House Report 103-520 had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House, it is now in order to debate the subject of the C-17 aircraft.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCING THE BIRTH OF ANN ELIZABETH
BARRETT

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have an important announcement. It is my great pleasure to be able to announce, for purposes of reinforcing the family values that this House believes in, that our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT] and his wife, Kristine, were blessed early this morning with a new baby girl. Her name is Ann Elizabeth, and I would ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the birth of Ann Elizabeth to the Barretts.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes of the 30 minutes which has been allocated to me to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to control that 15-minute block of time as he sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 15 minutes, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is said that those who do not study history are doomed to repeat it; 7 years and 12 days ago I stood in this spot and asked my colleagues to delete funding for the C-17 aircraft. We stated at that time that the plane was a paper airplane and would never fly. Very rarely in life are we granted an opportunity for a second chance and an opportunity

to correct our mistakes. But now today we have a chance and a choice to slow down this aircraft and hopefully reexamine its efficiency.

In 1987, the C-17 was already behind schedule, already over budget and far from being anything other than a paper airplane. Now, in 1994, the C-17 is behind schedule by years, over cost by billions, the Department of Defense is cutting deals with a contractor, and I do not know if the plane is flying. The tail has almost fallen off. It has scraped its belly on the runway during takeoff. Parachutists are not allowed to jump out of it, and the brakes burn when it tries to land. The paper airplane of 1987 is now a metal airplane that really should still be a paper airplane.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about adding on to the modest committee proposal and trying to spend even more money for this boondoggle? Mr. Chairman, this is pure folly, and I want to commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] in his approach to funding for the C-17 and strongly oppose any efforts to increase what has already been done responsibly by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the C-17 program and to note that later today we are going to have an opportunity to vote on two programs, one that would buy four C-17's in the next fiscal year and three or four other types of airplanes, commercial derivatives, if my colleagues will, or to buy six C-17's, and of course, as most of my colleagues know, I support the latter proposal, and the reason I do so is because we know that the C-141 fleet has got to be replaced. It was originally built in the 1960's with 1950's technology, and that technology is now old and needs to be replaced. In addition, the cargo that we need to carry into theater today is larger cargo than before, and so we need a new vehicle to get it there.

Now some of our good friends in the military who have some stature have come to some conclusions about this. General Shalikashvili, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says this:

Today there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter, the C-17.

He goes on to say:

The continuing myths of service life extension program for the C-141 or the ability of a commercial derivative to meet the needs of a core airlifter are just that, myths.

□ 1500

Then we have heard from General Sullivan, the Chief of Staff of the Army. He says very simply, the C-17 is the only aircraft that can get the

Army's outside combat system to the next war when required.

We have heard from General Hoar, the commander of CENCOM, and he says very simply, in the foreseeable future, the C-17 is the only airplane acting as the Nation's core military airlifter that can provide the capability and flexibility that we need.

So these people have come to some conclusions, and I think for some very good reasons. There are three reasons why I think we should support the Harman amendment this afternoon to increase the buy to six.

One is that we all know we need more airlift. We need more outsized airlift, and we need more airlift that is designed specifically for military purposes. That is simple. That is reason No. 1.

No. 2, buying six units instead of four decreases the unit price. The estimates are between \$30 and \$40 million a copy. Now, that is a powerful lot of money. One of the things that happened to some other weapons system programs was that we brought the buys down so low that it got so expensive per unit that none of us could support them. So it is important to keep our economy of scale at the right place.

The third reason we should support the buy of six, not four and four, is that the contractor, McDonnell-Douglas, has stated that it can do certain things in production models of this aircraft, and the only way to make them prove that they can do it is to give them the opportunity to provide for us the number of units that will bring that about.

So, for those three reasons, the C-17 and its capabilities of airdrop, its capabilities of providing a safety structure for troops that we send into battle. There is a dual facet safety concern here. One concern, of course, is getting the troops to the theater on time, recognizing that when they get in theater it is a very rough place to be, and so redundant systems have been built into the C-17 to make them safer.

But just as importantly, and maybe more importantly, we have to transport the materiel that these troops need there, and these are big systems, helicopter, troop carriers, Patriot missile systems. The C-17 can do that. It is the only airplane on the books, on the drawing board or elsewhere, that can deliver troops and the goods, the materials, the weapon systems, they need at the same time into the theater safely.

Finally, the large outsized cargo issue is a very important one. The C-5B is a great airplane and can carry that same cargo, almost the same tonnage. But it cannot land and it cannot service the same troops in the same theaters of operation that the C-17 can, primarily because the C-5 takes longer to land, twice as long, twice as much distance, as well as takes up too much room on the ground when it gets there.

We can fit five C-17's in the same space we can fit four C-5's, a very important issue.

Finally, and the last point I would make, is that once the C-17's are online, they are much more economical to operate. They are modern technology, not 1950's technology. The crew is three people, not six people, as is the case with the C-5B commercial wide bodies.

So for all of these reasons, I hope that in about an hour or so we will have an opportunity to vote on the Harman amendment, and I ask all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the C-17 and urge my colleagues to support the Harman amendment and oppose the Furse amendment.

I want to stipulate, I have one constituent employed on this aircraft's production. I got interested in this plane as a member of the Committee on Armed Services 15 long years ago. It is not something that is a recent interest of mine. While I learned about it from constituents who are with the Military Airlift Command at Travis Air Force Base, it is really an airplane that serves the needs of the Army.

We are here because as we bring home our troops from overseas, we have got to have military airlift capability to be in those places for peacekeeping or for humanitarian purposes that we deem important. I think as we saw what happened to our troops in Somalia, we understood how vulnerable they could be without armor, without personnel carriers, without tanks. We simply have to have the ability to go to places in the world that cannot be served by the larger C-5 aircraft which are now the mainstay of MAC.

This aircraft can get in 9,000 more runways worldwide, giving us the ability to respond with more effective measures, more quickly.

The question is whether or not this aircraft has been developed to the point where it lives up to its potential. I believe it has. And if we procure six aircraft at a cost that is available in the Armed Services authorization bill, we will know whether or not we can go ahead and procure what is a reduced number of aircraft, but still a substantial number of aircraft, at an affordable price. If we come forward with four and not six, the unit costs skyrocket and our ability to afford this airplane, which we need, is going to go out the window.

We have reduced our overseas facilities by 50 percent already. Eighty percent of the Army troops are going to be on American soil by 1997. If we want to be able to project them where we must around the world, we need the C-17.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the C-17 and urge my colleagues to support

the Harman amendment and oppose the Furse amendment.

The C-17 will provide the armed forces with a critical capability that they currently do not have.

The C-17 has the ability to land on smaller runways and maneuver on smaller taxiways and ramps. This capability means that the C-17 will have access to 9,000 more runways worldwide, making our response capability more effective and far-reaching.

The C-17's small austere airfield capabilities expand the options available to planners and operators conducting all airlift missions. It will substantially enhance our ability to respond to remote locations which will have a direct positive impact on peacekeeping and humanitarian missions.

I know there have been concerns about the C-17 program, but it is important to know that substantial corrections in program management and execution have been made. The C-17 program has successfully undergone exhaustive reviews by DOD, Defense Science Board, and independent agencies. The C-17 program is back on track.

However, the production rate of six aircraft in fiscal year 1995 is essential. If we do not restore the production level to six aircraft, the impact will be an increase of \$40 to \$50 million in the unit cost of the plane. We simply cannot afford this added cost.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, as we base more of our troops in the United States, our airlift capability becomes even more important. The Army states that by 1997, 80 percent of Army troops will be stationed on American soil. We simply cannot reduce or eliminate our modern airlift capability in light of these changes. As General Shalikashvili recently wrote, "there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter—the C-17."

We need the C-17. Defeat the Furse amendment and support the Harman amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Harman amendment which will be offered in about an hour to raise the number of C-17's we will buy this year from four to six. It is not a parochial amendment. This is not a partisan issue. That amendment will be supported I hope and expect by a broad coalition of Members, from liberal Democrats to conservative Republicans, from the top officials of the current administration to the leading members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The C-17 is a plane that was supported fully by the top officials of the last administration. There is a reason why there is such

broad-based support for this plane and why I believe there will be broad-based support for the buy of six in the House, and that is quite simply this: It makes enormous strategic sense, no matter what your view is of where America's military should go.

There is no question we are downsizing now, that we are moving back from forward bases, that we are going to end up with a military which has smaller numbers and more people concentrated in the United States. If we are to be a hemispheric power, if we are to continue being a world power, no matter what your view of American foreign policy should be, we have got to be able to get people from the United States to places around the world, whether for Desert Storm-like contingencies, or peacekeeping in Somalia or the Balkans, wherever you think we ought to be, we have got to get them from here to there. The only way to do that is to increase the lift that is accessible to them. And it is by far true, I think it is self-evidently true, that the C-17, if it works, is the best way of achieving that.

So whether you are for, and I am one of those people that believes we need to increase the amount of money that we are putting into the defense budget as opposed to what we have now planned over the next few years, or whether you are a person who believes that what the administration is planning to do is about right, whatever you think, Mr. Chairman, the C-17 is at the crux of our plans for the American military over the next few years.

The Department of Defense has a carefully tailored plan to buy six this year and six next year. This is the minimum that is necessary. The Harman amendment would not cost any more money. We are just reallocating. I urge the House to support it when it comes up in an hour or so.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Harman amendment to restore from four to six the number of C-17 aircraft authorized for fiscal year 1995. Not only is the C-17 currently being produced at a rate of six aircraft a year, it is done so with improved efficiency and decreasing cost. Was there a problem early on on the C-17 with wings? Yes. Was this problem addressed and resolved? Yes. Is this any longer an issue? No. To cite such an example as problematic today is a bogus argument and does not represent responsible, honest debate.

The program has undergone exhaustive review by both government and industry. Structural experts agree—C-17 testing has verified wing structures meet military strength requirements. In addition, aircraft delivery schedule and quality commitments are improving at all levels.

The future of air-deployable combat units rests largely with continued and successful production of the C-17. The military's airlift requirements have changed and they are unique.

The C-17 is the only aircraft in production that can carry outside cargo and has the versatility to rapidly reconfigure to carry vehicles, cargo, passengers, medical equipment and patients, or to perform airdrop missions. I urge my colleagues to consider this issue carefully.

Do not vote to send our troops, our young soldiers, into military crises on outdated aircraft whose capabilities are ill-suited to the missions of tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to support the Harman amendment. Sunday, I talked to our Under Secretary of the Air Force, a woman of impeccable academic reputation. She pledged to me this plane is now a safe plane, a needed plane, and we must have it for our airlift.

□ 1510

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that deals with defense. I am not a member of the authorizing committee, and normally I would not rise to take the time of the authorizing committee.

But we have a very, very important amendment coming to us later in the day that addresses the future of the C-17. There is little doubt that most of us recognize that before the end of the century over 80 percent of our troops will be here at home rather than stationed overseas. But America is going to continue to be a leader in the world. To be able to defend democracy, we have got to be able to deliver our materiel to our troops at foreign locations in times of crisis.

Above and beyond that, in our committee we constantly are talking about the fact that it is important in terms of shrinking budgets that we keep ourselves on the cutting edge of technology.

I would say, in terms of the C-17, all the technology in the world is going to do us no good if we cannot get our equipment there.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking today, however, because among those Members who worked as hard as anyone in support of the C-17, our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] has been a leader among those Members. Unfortunately, while he gave an extended discussion on the floor on Friday night, on Saturday morning he had to go to the hospital for surgery. So today I am suggesting to my colleagues, please be aware of the work of

the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN]. His efforts have made a tremendous difference in this debate.

If he were here today, he would say the following:

For those who do not pretend expertise on this subject, listen to the military experts. Secretary Dick Cheney: "It is an absolutely vital strategic asset, regardless of what size force we have in the long term."

The Joint Chiefs of Staff: "The C-17 aircraft continues to be the most cost-effective means to meet current and projected aircraft requirements."

Brigadier General John Handy: "Something like Somalia would have been a heck of a lot easier with the C-17 for planners in our organization."

All of the experts support the C-17 and know of its critical interest.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members, along with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], to join me in supporting the Harman amendment today on the floor.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON].

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the C-17 transport program. This is an issue of accountability. We must be accountable to our military troops, and to the taxpayers.

When our Nation sends our sons and daughters and grandsons and granddaughters, nineteen and twenty years old, to defend us, we should provide them equipment with top speed, efficiency, safety, and flexibility.

The military's top generals, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the President, all agree that the C-17 is the only alternative that meets the necessary requirements.

Mr. Chairman, we have invested \$15.8 billion in the C-17 program, an essential investment to ensure that our military can rapidly deploy all of the equipment that is imperative when we place the lives of young soldiers at risk.

The research and development is complete. It is time to go forward with this cost-effective program.

Mr. Chairman, by the end of the decade, in addition to the significant troop cutbacks we have already begun, we will have redeployed more than 80 percent of America's troops to the United States.

This will create a large demand on our strategic airlift forces and make the C-17 even more valuable than it is today.

More than any other transport carrier, the C-17 combines wartime capability with peacetime utility. In addition to use during regional conflicts, the C-17 will prove invaluable in humanitarian missions such as famine, flood and earthquake relief operations.

If the C-17 program is killed, not only do we lose the money we have in-

vested in this program, but we will have to restart other air cargo programs, at a cost of at least \$500 million.

The C-17 manufacturing line is already open, and building modern, capable aircraft. I ask this Congress to heed the advice of our Army and Air Force leaders. Support the C-17.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I used to fly fighter aircraft in the Air Force, and we did not fly old airplanes. I mean, when they got old, we got rid of them. I cannot believe in today's environment we are talking about not buying the Air Force any new airplanes for nearly 8 years.

Here we are arguing about a C-17, which is the guts of our airlift capability, going to protect this country for years to come in its fast reapplication capability, as we move our troops back home, gives us the ability to implement our foreign policy around the world.

I think we are going to rely ever more increasingly on the availability of airlift capability.

This aircraft provides access for oversized loads to 9,000 more runways, an increase of 300 percent over those available to C-5's and C-141's.

The commercial alternative that everybody proposes is not there. I doubt there is a 747 pilot in the world that wants to fly into some jungle in Africa or into Haiti even for that matter.

Our aircraft are ancient. Are we going to put our 20-year-old troopers in 40-year-old equipment and risk their lives by sending them into a combat area in an insufficient or subsufficient aircraft? I say no.

We need to vote for this amendment. Vote for America. Vote for freedom. Vote for the C-17.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] for introducing the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAVENEL].

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Harman amendment that will be offered, which restores procurement of the C-17 to the level requested by the administration—that is 6 planes for fiscal year 1995 and long-lead for 8 C-17's in 1996.

There are no two ways about it—this country has an airlift requirement to meet and the C-17 is the program to do it.

As the U.S. continues to pull troops out of forward deployed bases, we need an aircraft that can carry oversized and oversized cargo to small, austere airstrips anywhere in the world. The C-17 has the unique capability to accomplish such missions, which are sure to become commonplace in future contingency scenarios.

Let us face the facts. We have already made a significant investment in the C-17 of \$15.8 billion resulting in 26 planes, 7 of which are in operation down in Charleston. I have talked to the men and women who fly and maintain the C-17 and, having flown them over 800 hours, they enthusiastically endorse the aircraft, time and time again, the C-17 has performed above the expectations of these aircrews.

Certainly, the C-17 has not been a model acquisition program and I am not here to defend its record. However, the administration has put McDonnell Douglas on notice and the contractor is committed to making significant management and production changes. Congress must give the program this last chance to perform. Requesting only four planes for 1995, as the committee suggests, will slow the rate of production, drive up the unit cost, and throw 10,000 people out of work, not to mention severely hamper the future of strategic airlift. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Harman amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER].

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, and also one coming from a background in aerospace engineering, I strongly support the Harman amendment. We need the C-17 aircraft.

We learned from the Persian Gulf war that clearly we need better airlift and sealift in order to move our people and our materiel.

□ 1520

We also know that starting in 1995, we will be reducing 51 percent of our overseas assets, and therefore it is imperative that we have the ability to move materiel and troops very quickly to those areas where they are needed.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, as we downsize in Europe, going from 300,000 troops to 100,000, it is even more imperative that we have good airlift capability.

As an engineer with over 20 years' experience in the aerospace field, let me advise the Members, I have worked on many programs. In that period, I have never seen a program that did not have problems. Do we have problems? Of course we do. Will we resolve them? Yes, we will, so it is very important that we keep this program funded at appropriate levels. It is a program that I think has had a normal experience in aerospace development terms.

Let me also point out that this is not a hostile amendment. After the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], had a very excellent hearing on the C-17, 33 of the 56 members of the Committee on Armed Services signed a letter in support of raising the number of C-17's from four to six, so this is not a hostile amendment.

It is just a late-coming amendment that is supported by a majority of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Harman amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to also rise in support of the Harman-Horn-McCurdy-Saxton-Spratt-Johnson amendment, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] too, I think, is solidly behind this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me expand on one aspect of this debate that the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] so eloquently put forth to the House the other night during his special order when he was giving a very thorough analysis of the requirement for C-17's.

This is a debate about power projection, and our security around the world largely depends on our ability to project power quickly. That means to move American forces, including equipment and personnel, to critical strategic spots very, very quickly. In the words of Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, "It is the ability to get there firstest with the mostest."

We are now in a situation in Europe in which our formerly massive presence of over 300,000 military personnel is being directly reduced to around 100,000 personnel. That means we do not have the security, the airfield security, and the airfield security capability that we had a couple of years ago. It means now if we wanted to go in for these long runways that the C-5 requires, we might have to lose some people. We would certainly have conflicts, because one of the most strategic targets in any conflict is runways, airways, and the key to the C-17 debate when juxtaposed with the C-5 and its capabilities is runway length. The C-17 uses roughly half the runway that a C-5 uses.

What does that mean? It means in Europe that of all the runways that are available, the C-17 can access roughly ten times the number of airstrips and runways that the C-5 can access. That means instead of having to come in, if there is armor, if we are moving M-1 tanks into a particular area in Europe, or other heavy equipment, instead of having to fly this hardware into an area that may be 100 miles by road or 50 miles by road or 20 miles by road from where we want to strategically place it for conflict with the adversary, we can fly into an air base that is much closer to the action and can get there first.

In Europe we can access many times the runways with the C-17 that we can access with the C-5. We can access 5 times the runways in Europe, and we can access 10 times the runways in

South America, and we can access roughly 5 times the runways in Africa with C-17's than those we can access with C-5's.

This is a power projection issue, and the Harman amendment, so ably advocated by the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], who did a great job before he had to go to the hospital, and others, is absolutely an important amendment for this House to pass today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of the amendment that will soon be offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN]. As those on the Committee on Armed Services know, I have been very skeptical of the so-called Bottom-Up Review, and also the portion of it that states that we can fight two major regional contingencies nearly simultaneously.

If we do not have the capability of this airplane, of a C-17, that will be a show-stopper. That is an absolute show-stopper. That is why it is best that we proceed with this as best we can.

It is also important to point out that this amendment does not add to the total funding already recommended by the committee. It is supported by the President, and I think that it is the only logical choice that we can choose.

Mr. Chairman, there is an absolute need for a new airlifter which will carry outsized cargo and deliver it to smaller airfields. This should be pointed out, that there are many airfields that this is the only such airplane that can land and take off.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

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

Mr. Chairman, as one who is on a task force to go check on the C-17's and is a pilot that has spent a great deal of my time in the air, and know a little bit about airplanes, and know a little bit about what is happening in their air force today, if we are going to ask the United States to do what we are asking it to do every day almost on a yearly basis, to take and transport people all over the world, we are going to have to have a lift capability to do it, and we do not have it now. We have worn it out.

The C-17 is the only answer we have. Sure, we have engineering problems with all kinds of aircraft, and in the development of those aircraft, but that is no problem for anybody in the United States that has been building aircraft for as long as most of our builders have. This is a fine airplane, state-of-the-art, the best navigational equipment that any airplane has ever had in it.

I think it is absolutely an essential part of our airlift if we are going to dis-

perse people throughout the world, as we have been doing in all the hot spots we have had before. Mr. Chairman, I am for the C-17, and all six of them.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], that he gave us some sage advice several times at the beginning of this year and last year and even the year before, that if we come up with armed services amendments, they had better be cost-saving or revenue-neutral.

I think the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] took due note of this recommendation, because this is a revenue-neutral amendment. It is merely allocating existing funds. We cannot think about revenue-neutral enough around here.

We are all dedicating our speeches today to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], because the C-17 is made in his district. He has been a strong, forceful, and passionate as well as very accurate and informative proponent of this great airlift system. He is in for some minor surgery, similar to BOB DOLE's recent surgery, so of course prayers from all of those within reach of my voice are with STEVE HORN. He will be back after the break, and I hope we are going to have a big victory for him here today.

Mr. Chairman, the other gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, mentioned the excellent presentation given by STEVE HORN before he headed back to California on the floor a few nights ago. Here is one of the charts he used. I put it out today on the back of a "Dear Colleague," and in the terms of our great loadmasters they used this word, "throughput capability." That means if we have an average 500,000 square ramp, we can only get three C-5's on that ramp as they are loading and unloading. We can only get three civilian cargo airlift big giants 747's on this same runway, but we can get eight C-17's on such a ramp, in addition to the aforementioned many times, and it should be mentioned, 10,000 additional airfields around the world where only a C-17 Globemaster III can land, and a 747, or our big C-5 Galaxy, cannot land; the C-17 has a throughput capability of 3,852 tons a day, more than double what we can get from the other two large excellent big lifters.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, let us listen to Gordo and Shali, our chief of staff of the Army and our chairman of the joint chiefs.

General John M. Shalikashvili says, "Today there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter—the C-17 Globemaster."

General Gordon Sullivan says, "The C-17 is the only aircraft that can get

the Army's outsized combat systems to the next war when required."

Mr. Chairman, that simulator is waiting for you in Long Beach, sir. I flew it over a year ago. It amazed me. This big C-17 has a stick just like a fighter aircraft. That is why our great Gary Cooper from Texas, Congressman SAM JOHNSON, is so enthused over this aircraft. Like the B-2, it has a stick. It flies like a fighter. Imagine an M-1 30-ton tank in the back of your C-17 and flying with a stick like a fighter aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, the C-17 has had its growing pains, Lord knows, but my F-100 that I flew on active duty also had growing pains. They were falling out of the sky like cats and dogs in the middle and late 1950's, and it turned out to be one of our most stable air-to-ground aircraft in the Vietnam war. Some aircraft have no problems going through a test program like a B-2 Spirit. Others have growing pains. We are hopefully through the growing pains with the C-17.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone in this Chamber to vote for the C-17, for our Army and Air Force, and for the future of all of our armed services.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD my "Dear Colleague" letter as follows:

SUPPORT THE C-17—IT MEETS U.S. MILITARY REQUIREMENTS

"Our nation has a critical need for inter-theater airlift modernization if we are to maintain our ability to project forces and respond to humanitarian missions worldwide. Our C-141 aircraft are wearing out. The C-17 aircraft continues to be the most cost effective means to meet current and projected airlift requirements. The C-17's ability to deliver outsize cargo, combined with its special capability to use austere fields, will provide us with modern, highly capable strategic airlift."

WILLIAM J. PERRY,
Secretary of Defense.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We need the C-17. It is as simple as that.

Military leaders up and down the chain of command from our young Air Force pilots to the Secretary of Defense agree that the C-17 meets existing military requirements. Consider what other military leaders have said about the C-17:

"Today there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter—the C-17."

GEN. JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI,
Chairman, Joints Chiefs of Staff.

"The C-17 is the only aircraft that can get the Army's outsized combat systems to the next war when required."

GEN. GORDON SULLIVAN,
Army Chief of Staff.

Reprinted on the back of this letter is a diagram depicting another unique and important feature of the C-17, throughput capability or off-load capacity and turn around time on the ground. (Diagram not reproducible in RECORD.) As this diagram clearly shows, the C-17 has much greater throughput capability than existing military airlifters or civilian cargo aircraft. Such off-load capacity and turn around time could be vital,

especially during the first few days of a military build-up in an overseas conflict.

Please listen to our military leaders and why they need the C-17. By funding six instead of four C-17 aircraft in FY 1995, we can ensure this defense bill meets our defense requirements.

Best regards,

ROBERT K. DORNAN,
U.S. Congressman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, surely, the next Saddam Hussein will not be dumb enough to park his tanks in the desert for 6 months. Very simply—that is exactly why we need the C-17.

The most important issue in this debate is that the C-17 will save the lives of young American soldiers and marines.

How will the C-17 save lives? By moving American troops quickly into areas of conflict with the proper weapons and equipment.

As we pay tribute to the 50th anniversary of D-day, we should ask ourselves this question: Would we have asked brave American soldiers to storm the beaches of Normandy without adequate weapons and equipment? Certainly not.

Whether you are a hawk or dove on defense doesn't really matter on this issue. The C-17 is not about making wars, it is about saving the lives of young Americans whenever we call them to duty.

I urge Members to support the Harman-Horn amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of the C-17 program. We spend a lot of time talking about force structure and our needs to meet national security interests. We can do all that talk we like, but if you do not have the military lift capacities by air and sea to get soldiers to the battlefield, the minimum risk for which generals talk about will be a reality in loss of life on the battlefield.

I do feel, though, a little odd saying I want to give my full support to the C-17 program given the fact of the track record of the contractor. That is what brings us to this debate today.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say that Mr. Deutch of the Department of Defense outlined an excellent program to make the contractor responsive. I want to support the administration wherever possible, and I will support the administration in this endeavor to give the incentive to the contractor to be a low-cost producer. That means in support of the Harman-Horn amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this aircraft is a necessary component of meeting our military strategic lift requirements in the coming decades. We have had much debate in the House about the size and

capabilities of the military force outlined in the Bottom-Up Review. All of these arguments are futile if we do not have, like I said, the lift capacities to move our forces wherever needed throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, the C-17 gives us that capacity. The C-17 is an aircraft designed and built to meet the specific military need, the delivery of outsized cargo to remote and unimproved airfields in support of our forces during a contingency or conflict throughout the world. This is a most important issue for our national security.

Mr. Chairman, according to the research and development center, a fleet of C-17's is more cost-effective than any combination of C-17's, commercial wide-body aircraft, C-5/B's or C-141's.

Mr. Chairman, as we downsize our military, we must buy the most capable, effective equipment available for our men and women in uniform. The C-17 is a giant leap forward in our aircraft capabilities and is sorely needed to replace our rapidly aging fleet. I almost feel, though, that a request was made for a Jeep and the Air Force decided that we would not give just a Jeep, "We're going to go out and give you the Grand Cherokee."

Mr. Chairman, it makes me feel a little uncomfortable about us buying the Jeep Grand Cherokee and possibly having a very expensive aircraft where it will get to the point we are saying, "Maybe we shouldn't take it to the battlefield, it might get shot down."

Mr. Chairman, I will support the administration to make the contractor a low-cost producer because the incentive is built into this agreement, that if they do not comply, they are only going to buy their 40 and then we are going to go with a commercial mix.

Mr. Chairman, I support the administration, I urge my colleagues to support the Harman-Horn amendment, and I wish my colleague STEVE HORN the very best in his recovery from cancer.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], the author of an amendment that will come before the body.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, today I am also offering an amendment. This is an amendment on the C-17, and what it would do is it would stop production of the C-17 at the 4 we have already bought, that will bring us up to 30 C-17's, and it will then go to take our additional airlift out of commercial wide-body planes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to cite a couple of quotes about this program. John Deutch, Deputy Secretary of Defense, came before the House Armed Services Committee in February of this year.

Mr. Deutch was asked about the program's performance, and he replied: "I think it's awful."

Les Aspin, former secretary of defense, said: "The C-17 is late, it's over

ceiling price, and it has serious operational deficiencies."

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would get us the airlift we need, it would get it to us quicker than if we go with the whole C-17 program. My amendment would give us 30 C-17's, and it would save \$16 billion.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harman amendment which will be offered in just a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as we work on the defense budget this year, it is vitally important to keep in mind what kind of military we need for the post-cold-war era.

In Iraq, Somalia, and Bosnia, we have learned that this new era will be marked by sudden, unexpected crises in remote corners of the world. We will confront the urgent need to deliver humanitarian assistance or respond to major acts of aggression. And because we are losing so many overseas bases, we will need to conduct these operations largely from the continental United States.

In this kind of environment, virtually every defense expert and every study of U.S. military policy agrees that our forces must be flexible, agile, and strategically mobile, capable of responding rapidly to unexpected crises. Nearly everyone agrees that strategic lift, both airlift and sealift, must rank among our top priorities.

The C-17 represents exactly the sort of capability we need for this new era.

Those of us who support the C-17 are well aware that the Air Force must make greater use of civilian aircraft for transport purposes. But we are equally well aware that civilian planes alone cannot fulfill all our airlift needs.

They cannot handle all forms of military cargo, or the right combinations of it. They cannot operate from short, rough landing fields, as the C-17 will do.

General Shalikashvili, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said that "The C-17 represents a capability that the Armed Forces absolutely need to have."

Once we decide we need the C-17, the decision to buy six planes per year becomes the obvious choice.

This rate will allow the Air Force to complete its scheduled purchase of 40 C-17's—a number the Air Force calls the minimum that is militarily useful. DOD can then pass judgment on the contractor and decide whether to buy more.

Buying six planes per year will allow the contractor to bring costs down and ensure that we produce the C-17 at the most efficient rate.

And most importantly, with the retirement of older transport planes and

the increasing potential for regional crises, the need for the C-17 grows every day. We need them in our force structure as quickly as possible.

We have an opportunity today to make a strong statement about the importance of airlift to our national security strategy. And if we are going to press forward with this critical program, we should do so in the way that makes the most sense for the taxpayer—by purchasing six planes per year.

□ 1540

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harman-Horn-McCurdy-Saxton-Spratt-E.B. Johnson amendment to restore C-17 funding. Mr. Chairman, if we get support for anything in this Congress from both sides of the aisle it must be good. I am proud to be speaking in favor of a bill with so many strong bipartisan sponsors.

The C-17 has the support of President Clinton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff John M. Shalikashvili, Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan of the U.S. Army and Gen. J.P. Hoar from Cent Com.

The C-17 is a major logistic tool, filling a vital military and humanitarian need. The C-17 has the ability to use 10 times the airfields as any of the alternatives that have been offered, and they cannot compete. The C-17 has the ability to carry oversized cargo, the M-1 tank, that the other aircraft cannot.

The C-17 was designed to fill a need in the New World Order of an aircraft capable of carrying heavy payloads to austere airfields. The C-17 is the ideal aircraft to meet this need.

Mr. Chairman, we have invested a lot of money into the C-17 program. The C-17 fills a vital military mission and deserves our support.

The C-17 is flying and McDonnell Douglas has met its contractual requirements. The seven C-17's at Charleston Air Force Base are getting excellent reviews by the men and women flying and maintaining them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the C-17.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harman amendment to restore funding for the C-17 strategic airlift program because it is the most cost-effective transport plane that we have, and I urge my colleagues to support the Harman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are living at a crossroads in history. As the cold war subsides and new international relationships are formed, our Armed Forces must have flexible equipment and needs the C-17 for the wide range of se-

curity and humanitarian missions which lie ahead.

We are living in ever changing times and new international relationships are forming throughout the globe. Perhaps more than at any time in history our Armed Forces are engaged in assisting those who are the victims of famines, earthquakes, floods and other natural catastrophes.

All around the world, we are bringing our military men and women and their families back home. As we embark upon these courses, our defense posture requires that we have the ability to rapidly respond with a variety of equipment to unfamiliar places about which we might have very limited information. How many of us knew the politics, history, and geography of Rwanda before the bloody revolution began just a few short months ago? Still, our military was asked to go into that country on a moment's notice and help take our diplomatic staff and their families to places of safety. The Air Force's C-141 accomplished this special mission. But the C-141's are aging and must be replaced. They have served our Nation in times of trouble, but their usefulness is drawing to an end. The C-17 is the aircraft designed to replace the C-141. The C-17 can carry twice the load of the C-141 and yet land on short, austere airfields like those found in Rwanda and other trouble spots around the world. The C-17 is unique in its cargo carrying ability and its short field landing ability—two attributes which typify what is often most demanded in a contemporary humanitarian mission.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support full funding of the C-17 program because it is crucial to our defense system. Criticism of the C-17 has been unfounded. Independent analyses show the C-17 is the most cost-effective solution for meeting America's airlift needs. The need for the C-17 program has been established. Military leaders agree that it is the most capable, cost effective transport plane. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Harman amendment. The C-17 development is the program our country truly needs as we prepare for the challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, last December when Secretary Aspin announced the decision to take control of the troubled C-17 program, I applauded his efforts. While limiting C-17 purchases to 40 aircraft is a positive step, I remained very concerned.

Over the last 3 years, I chaired five hearings where we heard testimony that painted a bleak picture. The C-17 program suffers from massive technical and financial problems ranging from defective wings to hundreds of millions of dollars in extraordinary payments to the prime contractor, McDonnell Douglas.

We cannot solve these very problems by throwing more money at the program or continuing with business as usual. The taxpayer should not foot the bill for hundreds of millions of dollars on a program that has been in default since its inception. This sends exactly the wrong message to defense contractors, and is the kind of practice we must end if we are

truly going to reinvent the procurement process as promised by President Clinton.

Just consider what we are being asked to buy—an Airlifter which will never come close to meeting its original specification. As I hear Member after Member extol the C-17's short runway capability, I must point out that today this capability simply does not exist. Similarly, when I hear Member after Member praise the C-17's global reach, I must point out that unlike the C-5 and the Boeing 747, the C-17 cannot even fly across the Atlantic Ocean without a mid-air refueling. And when I hear Member after Member praise the C-17's durability, I must point out that the C-17 has suffered massive structural deficiencies, from pervasive fuel leaks to defective wings that repeatedly have failed static load tests. All this in an Airlifter that costs more than half a billion dollars per copy.

There is also a serious credibility problem with this program. For years, our committee was repeatedly assured by senior Air Force officers that the integrity of the wing was absolutely not in question. That was before the first wing failure ever occurred. Further, we were assured that the Air Force would never go below the threshold specifications identified by the U.S. Transportation Command. Now even those thresholds have been waived.

In the face of these facts, I would suggest that this is indeed a case where the buyer should beware. It is time to face the fact that the C-17 program is a failure—as the C-17's capabilities decline, its costs continues to grow.

Over the last 3 years, we have repeatedly been told that the C-17 program "has turned the corner." But the hard cold truth is that the C-17 suffers serious problems that will not go away.

Under Chairman DELLUMS' leadership, the Armed Services Committee took the first necessary steps to secure needed airlift capability with existing aircraft that actually work. I commend the gentleman from California for his farsighted leadership in addressing this critical national security need. This is the prudent course, not additional buys of the technically and financially flawed C-17.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me sum up the general debate on this side, among the advocates of this amendment, first by saying what the amendment is all about.

When the administration sent its bill here, the National Defense Authorization Act of 1995, they requested six C-17's in fiscal 1995 and eight C-17's in fiscal 1996.

When we did the mark in our committee, we cut that request from six C-17's in 1995 to four C-17's, and we took \$550 million saved in that cut and put it in something called nondevelopmental alternative aircraft, NDAA, something other than a C-17, which

could perform the mission. And what we would do by this amendment, based on what DOD and the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Deutch, has since told us, is take that \$550 million and put it back in the C-17 line so we can buy six in 1995 and eight in 1996 as the Defense Department originally requested. The amount of money is the same, \$2.4 billion going in, \$2.4 billion coming out. It is identical.

Let me give you three reasons, give the Members of the House three reasons, why I think we should all support this amendment. First of all, we need the capacity. Everybody has made that argument here. As we draw down our forces and pull them back from Europe and overseas, we need more airlift than we have ever needed before.

If the C-17 performs as promised, and that is a big "if," if the C-17 performs as it is supposed to, it fills a need for airlift better than any alternative we have got. You do not have to take my word for that.

In this very bill 2 years ago, the House and the Senate, in passing the National Defense Authorization Act, directed the Department of Defense to do an independent, disinterested, cost-effectiveness and operational analysis of this very program, the C-17, a COEA, in DOD parlance. Here it is, prepared in December 1993, completed then, delivered to us just a week or two ago.

If you look on page 9 of it, the executive summary says the C-17 is the preferred military airlifter for several reasons. COEA says in the executive summary that the C-17 is the preferred military airlifter because, first of all, of its unique capacity for outsized cargo. Not unique, because the C-5 also has that capacity. It can handle things, it can carry things other wide-body airplanes cannot handle, M-1 tanks, Patriot missile batteries, helicopters, Apache attack helicopters, things too large to get in any other kind of airplane which will go in the cargo compartment of this airplane.

Second, not only in the air but on the ground it has unique capabilities and particularly on the ground, due to the footprint, the size of the wingspan.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Is it not true that we have 120 C-5B's, all of which are capable of carrying the outsized capability? In your COEA study it says 85 percent of what we have got to transport is either oversized, not the big stuff or bulk, so a nondevelopmental aircraft, whether it is a C-5 or an MD-11 or a stripped-down C-17 or, heaven forbid, a 747 freighter, could carry 85 percent of what we have got to take out there. It seems to me with 30 or 40 C-17's plus 120 C-5's, we have got all the outsized capability we need.

Mr. SPRATT. Reclaiming my time, this amendment anticipates our going to 40 C-17's, going from 26 to 40; air mobility to command says this is militarily the minimum viable force, 40 planes, a couple of squadrons. We are to provide for downtime, for maintenance, provide for trainers. This is a minimal viable force.

Beyond that, we may buy up to 120, which is the current requirement of C-17's, or we may mix the fleet.

This leaves wide open to the Air Force and to the Department of Defense the option of mixing the fleet with 747's, 767's, MD-11's, and wide-bodied airplanes. Let us not get too zealous about that.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will yield further, we have a lot of outsize capability with 120 C-5's that can carry everything a C-17 can carry.

Mr. SPRATT. But there are some unique features to this airplane other than outsize capacity. It can airdrop. It can drop paratroops. Granted, it has a problem that has to be corrected. It can maneuver on the ground. It can land on short, austere strips, and a 747 simply cannot pull that off; it cannot land on a short strip; it cannot take off fully loaded on a short strip.

Consequently, the C-17's, because of these unique capabilities, make it separate and distinct from anything else we can choose from.

As you have heard here, it can land in hundreds more airports, hundreds more runways, in Africa, in Asia, in the place it is likely to be deployed, things the 747 cannot do.

And that is why the Air Force says let us buy 40 and assess the viability of this airplane and decide from there whether we want to mix the fleet or go forward and buy 120 airplanes.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes, the remainder of my time, and I take that amount of time simply because no one has taken the floor to explain nor attempt to defend the position established by the House when we reported this bill from the House Committee on Armed Services, and I want to briefly outline the position of the Committee on Armed Services that brought the position of the C-17 that is reflected in the House bill.

In so doing, I want to reiterate over and over and over again in the moments that I have with you to say this, very simply, Mr. Chairman: The issue is not the C-17, the issue is airlift.

It changes the nature of the debate, Mr. Chairman, when the discussion is not the C-17, the issue is airlift.

I will repeat that many times in the course of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the intention of this gentleman to focus on the national security issue that should

drive the decision on what to do about the C-17 program. That issue is airlift capability. Airlift for the number of needs is necessary, and these needs include our participation in multinational peacekeeping operations, which this gentleman supports.

Our airlift problem is not just our need for short fields, for outsize cargo capability of the C-17; the heart of the problem is the planned retirement of our C-141 fleet in the 1995 to 2006 period. The loss of this large portion of our aircraft capability must be offset, and I will attempt to make that point clearly, and unequivocally, Mr. Chairman.

We face a difficult task. How to provide enough overall airlift capability and C-17 capabilities within a realistic spending level. That is the question. If there are so many dollars in a limited-dollar environment, in a military budget that is going down, how many dollars do you project annually that is realistic that you choose to spend for the purpose of airlift? And then the question is how do you buy the airlift that is necessary for this country for these dollars? Straightforward, straightforward, straightforward, Mr. Chairman. The issue is not the C-17, the issue is airlift.

There will be an amendment that comes up, and that amendment is where the department sees salvation primarily in higher C-17 buys. But large enough buys to offset this loss are not affordable at likely budget levels as the data is the Department's own C-17 affordability assessment proves.

Buying eight planes per year, the level DOD specifies in their C-17 white paper, and the level consistent with their affordability report for the next 14 years, leaves us with less airlift than we already have today. Mr. Chairman, I will repeat: By simply engaging in a C-17 buy strategy against the backdrop of the reality that C-141's are being retired during that 10-year period that I laid out, your airlift goes down. It does not come up until way out far beyond the year 2000.

So, how do you engage in a strategy to buy airlift that does not get you back to square one until way out about the year 2008, 2010? Mr. Chairman, under that plan we would not get back to today's level until 2008, despite spending \$30 billion. The answer is twofold: Buy the specialized capabilities of a yet-to-be-determined number of C-17's, boosted with aircraft that more cheaply restored the aggregate airlift capability than we lose by C-141 retirements, at the same budget level of airlift as we have today. This is a strategy embodied in H.R. 4301 which will offset the C-141 retirement, give us more aggregate and outsize airlift capability than we have today for less cost than the strategy behind the amendment that would simply put us back to the number 6.

These conclusions are not just this gentleman's conclusions, Mr. Chairman. If that were the case, that is arguable. But an Air Mobility Command study shows that even with the buy of eight C-17's per year, only a substantial buy of complementary nondevelopmental or alternative aircraft in the next 5 years equivalent to 35 to 55 aircraft would prevent a significant decline in our airlift capability by the year 2201.

Not this gentleman's study, Mr. Chairman, the Air Mobility Command study. The Department has not, not, to this gentleman's knowledge, refuted those findings.

Under the provision of H.R. 4301, C-17 fleet will continue to grow.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to many people on the floor as if it were "C-17's to no C-141's." Let us not distort each other's position. The bill has some C-17's in it, and the bill allows that strategy to go forward. The bill adds 4 C-17's for a total of 30 and 4 more for next year.

Beyond that, if the contractor can fix its problem, we retain the option of moving to higher rates. If the program does not improve, we can still decide to buy more C-17's to reach the level of 40 that the Department has told us was militarily acceptable. No one is talking about having no C-17's. That is not in the real world. So you build a strawman when you make that argument.

The issue, again, Mr. Chairman, is not the C-17; the issue is airlift.

Keep in mind that buying 4 C-17's per year would give us a fleet of 58 by the year 2005; combined with our existing fleet that the gentleman pointed out of 120 C-5's, will be able to lift over twice as much outsize cargo than we could just 7 years ago, when the airlift challenge was to move army heavy divisions across the Atlantic in 10 days, those days, to fight the vast forces of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union no longer exists, Mr. Chairman. The Warsaw Pact has vanished off the radar screen. And these were adversaries who were far better armed, far better trained, far better led than the forces many of my colleagues contemplate with these scenarios of the future, North Korea, Iran, or Iraq, that worry many of my colleagues today.

In addition to this outsize capability, the airlift fleet envisioned by the bill would have a substantially better ability to carry the bulk and oversize cargos that made up 90 percent of the air cargos of Desert Storm than would the airlift fleet envisioned in the Department's plans. Again, the issue is airlift, not the C-17.

The C-17 cost and operational effectiveness analysis study also validates the path that H.R. 4301 embodies, Mr. Chairman, and calls into question the Pentagon's approach. It shows that mixes of C-17's and complementary air-

craft are as cost effective as a pure fleet of 120 C-17's in hauling outside cargo. In addition, the analysis shows those same mixes are far more cost effective in carrying oversized cargo than a pure C-17 fleet. There is wide agreement that the commercial aircraft are far better bulk cargo carriers than the C-17's.

Furthermore, the Department's cost and operational effectiveness analysis shows the superiority of mixed fleets, Mr. Chairman. It understates that 747's performance by at least 22 percent, according to the Air Mobility Command's own data, not this gentleman's data. It assigns costs to the mixed fleets that internal DOD documents prove are improper. Thus mixes of C-17's and 747's are even better than the analysis says and better than pure C-17 fleets.

Department officials have stressed outside cargo as a main factor responsible for their strong preference for the C-17. But there is a major gap between the rhetoric on this issue and the reality of their own data that they provide us. The Department may tell us that oversized cargo is the main factor to plan for in a major regional contingency, but their own C-17 cost and operational effectiveness analysis disputes this.

The Department finally delivered that analysis to us last week; a little late in the day as we attempt to address this issue. It states, "In the first 30 days in these scenarios [the two MRC's]"—that is major regional contingencies—"used by the joint staff mobility requirements study, 15 percent of the delivery requirement is outside cargo, 55 percent is oversized, and the remaining 30 percent is bulk," the point that I think my colleague was trying to make.

□ 1600

Their data shows that after the first 30 days the percentage of outsized cargo requirements actually drops.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other issues that I would want to make here, but I do not want time to run out. Let me just finish, and then I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. Chairman, I make this point: The issue is not the C-17. The issue is airlift. Let me tell my colleagues how we got to this point.

The administration should have come before us in a timely fashion as we proceeded to try to mark up this bill. The leadership gave us this date, come on the floor before Memorial Day break. We were under tremendous stress and tremendous strain. The administration did not answer on the record for the record in a timely fashion, when we were preparing to mark up this bill, the concerns of the criticism raised by the GAO. So, what my colleagues have ringing in their ears was a very intelligent analysis with a series of critical

issues laid out by the GAO. So, the administration had not done a compelling selling job, had not attempted to support this program at a level that my colleagues would have felt comfortable, and they certainly had not answered these ringing criticisms. So, we have the responsibility of marking, in the absence of the administration's set of arguments, so we put before the Committee on Armed Services a proposal that said the issue is not the C-17, the issue is airlift. We figured the annual amount of dollars authorized for this purpose would probably be in the neighborhood of \$2.5 billion. We said, "With \$2.5 billion annually, how do you get the airlift that you need?"

So, Mr. Chairman, this led us to this four plus nine developmental aircraft, a mixture.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, under the rule, does the gentleman and the ranking member have an opportunity to strike the last word?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Once the amendment is pending, the gentleman from California and the gentleman from South Carolina do have that opportunity, but not until an amendment is pending.

Pursuant to House Resolution 431, it is now in order to consider the amendments printed in part 6 of House Report 103-520 relating to the C-17 aircraft, which shall be considered in the following order:

A, the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], or the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], or the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY], or the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], or the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAM JOHNSON], or the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT]; and, B, the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HARMAN: Page 19, strike out line 18 and all that follows through line 3 on page 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Of the amount provided in section 103 for procurement of aircraft for the Air Force—

(1) \$103,000,000 shall be available for Non-Developmental Alternative Aircraft procurement; and

(2) \$2,303,402,000 shall be available for the C-17 aircraft program, of which—

(A) \$2,249,819,000 is for procurement of six C-17 aircraft;

(B) \$47,475,000 is for advance procurement of up to eight C-17 aircraft for fiscal year 1996; and

(C) \$6,108,000 is for C-17 modifications.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to send my own best wishes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] who is a principal cosponsor of this bipartisan amendment and who is not able to be with us today because he is in the hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this amendment has overwhelming bipartisan support, including the overwhelming support of a bipartisan group of the Armed Services Committee. We are in this position because, when we marked up and reported our bill, DOD had not adequately justified funding six planes. For this reason, most of us supported the chairman's mark which he himself characterized as a "place holder".

This chart demonstrates that our amendment involves the identical amount of money in the bill as reported by the committee. We would simply redeploy this money to support procurement of six C-17s rather than four, and fund a competition for non-developmental aircraft.

I would say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] that what we are doing in this bill very adequately deals with his concerns and will assure us that commercial wide bodies can be a part of our airlift mix for the future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] has expired.

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] would like, if she needs an additional minute, I yield a minute of the 2 minutes she had reserved for me at this time to her. Would the gentlewoman like an additional minute to complete her statement?

Ms. HARMAN. Why don't I just take 30 seconds of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, what we need to keep our eye on is that we are not adding money to the airlift program. We are simply rearranging the money so that we can restore the ad-

ministration's original request. The chairman of our full committee, for whom I have the greatest respect, says airlift is the issue, not the C-17. I agree, and I quote from General Shalikhshvili:

"Today there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter, the C-17."

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I took time to try to lay out the position that is reported in the bill, H.R. 4301. Let me, in a few moments, explain how we got to this point.

A number of our colleagues requested, during the time that we were marking up the bill, that we bring the administration in subsequent to the markup of the bill in the House Committee on Armed Services and hopefully that that hearing would take place prior to our coming to the floor. I said to my colleagues in the spirit of fairness, in the spirit of openness and cooperation we would ask the administration to come before the committee, and all of my colleagues, or virtually all of my colleagues, because the bill passed 55 to 1, when we laid this proposal on the table we said, absent a ringing declaration, a ringing set of supporting arguments for this bill, that the House position, the position that we articulated, was a sound position. I turned to everyone in several meetings, Mr. Chairman, and said, "If any of you have a better idea, lay it on the table, and, in the spirit of give and take, we can discuss that, if there is a new position that anyone wants to assume." No one laid a new idea on the table, and everyone essentially bought onto what is in the House position.

Then they said that they would like to have the administration come. The administration did come, and we had several hours of hearings. After those hearings, Mr. Chairman, a number of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California and 30-some other members of the committee, decided, based upon that presentation, that now they had more information, more facts, because they felt that the administration had done a, quote, adequate or good job in addressing the GAO criticisms and laying out the concerns and the arguments that they felt needed to be on the record, and they raised some questions with respect to the proposal that we offered. On the basis of that they were compelled then to go back to the original position of the six planes.

That is a legitimate thing to do, Mr. Chairman. I am not quarreling with that. I simply wanted to say, one, the position enunciated in the bill was not just a placeholder amendment. It was carefully thought out, carefully con-

ceived and, I believe, can be defended anywhere openly and in a very straightforward fashion. I think all of my colleagues here are going to have to make a very serious decision about this program and about the issue of airlift. I urge them to listen very carefully. I frankly think, and I may be wrong, that this debate turns on one single issue, one single issue, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Deutsch says, "If the contractor is able to build 6, we will learn more about that contractor's ability to build 12 than if you have them building 4." Now, if my colleagues buy that argument, then it will lead them in one direction. If my colleagues think that that argument is debatable, it may lead them in a different direction. But I personally think that that is what the issue turns on.

□ 1610

The question is what do you think the learning curve is. The Secretary repeated that on more than one occasion. I need 6 because the learning curve on whether this contractor will be able to build 12 down the road, that gives me that answer. If you accept that argument, perhaps there is efficacy to it. But I think that is where the issue lies on this discussion.

I simply wanted to discuss that in the spirit necessary of openness we held a hearing. A number of my colleagues were compelled to move beyond the committee position. This is no personal thing with us.

You now have two considered positions on this issue, one thought through by the committee and one agreed to after the committee markup and after Secretary Cheney came before the committee, and they are both out there.

I think one can argue both of them very strongly, perhaps even effectively, but they are two different strategies. They are two very, very different approaches, and they have two different consequences. Let me just make one final comment. Secretary Cheney said there are three parts to this C-17 program. There is the settlement, there is the 2-year program, and there is the nondevelopmental airlift aircraft part of it.

Well, this amendment only addresses two, not three. Everyone agreed to put the settlement aside at this point, because it raises a number of issues that go beyond the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services, perhaps to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, perhaps to the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that is something that has to be resolved in a different context, given the process that we operate under.

So we are back to the second part. Mr. Cheney said give me all of these or kill the program. We even laid that

proposal on the table among my colleagues. We said do you want to kill it? There was not a consensus.

So the issue we wanted to grapple with, short of killing the program and short of going whole hog in the program in the context of the markup, was what do you do, absent a compelling set of arguments that refuted what GAO said? We came with that in our bill. My colleagues now are saying that they have new information that leads them to a new position. Listen very carefully, make your own judgment.

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise and say that the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has fully explained the position in the committee, and I think fairly. At the time the subcommittee and the committee marked, we did not have this information, and many of us who did not serve on the committee had asked that there be a hearing prior to coming to the floor.

We had the hearing, Secretary Cheney did come, and I think the overwhelming majority of the members of the committee, upon hearing that testimony, demonstrated both by voting to go back to this provision that Ms. HARMAN is supporting and offering, and also signing a letter which I believe is more of the "ringing endorsement" that the chairman talked about.

Because we believe we are overcoming the problems in the C-17 procurement, this is the most efficient rate. Congress should not micromanage this contract. We are saying that there is sufficient evidence now presented by the administration that leads us to believe that this is the most appropriate way to move forward on this program.

It does, not, as the chairman said, include the settlement, which I think is a contentious issue which is better resolved at a later point.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the C-17 cargo plane program. Specifically, I would like to urge my colleagues to support the Harman amendment which restores the administration's request for six aircraft instead of four as in the current bill language and oppose the Furse amendment which terminates the program entirely.

In a time when we are trying to reduce our Nation's defense spending and decrease our worldwide force structure, supporting the construction of six C-17's in fiscal year 1995 makes the most economical and military sense.

Authorizing the construction of six instead of four planes is the least expensive way to meet the Nation's mili-

tary airlift needs. Maintaining a production rate of six per year will decrease the unit costs of the planes and will not undercut the Department of Defense's strategy to control program costs. This rate will also allow the prime contractor, McDonnell Douglas, to show that it can bring costs down and ensure that we produce the C-17 in the most efficient manner. Additionally, it is important to mention that the Harman amendment does not add to the overall cost of the bill but merely reprograms funds already included in the bill to cover the cost of the additional two planes.

In this post-cold-war era, there is less of a need to station troops abroad and maintain large military installations around the globe. As we have seen in Grenada, the Persian Gulf, and Somalia, however, there is still a great need for the United States military to have the capability to move large numbers of troops and equipment in and out of remote areas quickly. Our current airlift capabilities simply do not make the grade. The C-141's, which was designed in the 1950's and produced in the 1960's are falling apart and cannot land at small austere airfields. While the C-5 is able to carry similar payloads as the C-17, the C-5 complicates deployment planning because it requires excessively long and wide runways which are not always available in developing countries. Further, the Air Force has testified that there have been instances at large military fields in Europe when operations had to be suspended because a C-5 was unloading and could not get off the runway to allow other planes to land or take off. If we are to reduce our global military presence, it is essential that we continue building C-17's which give us the ability to move troops—and the essential equipment needed to protect them—as quickly as possible.

Terminating the C-17 program would have a disastrous affect on the economy of my congressional district. The F117 engine used in the C-17 is constructed at the Pratt & Whitney plant located in Middletown, CT. I am very proud of the work my constituents have done on this engine. First of all, the engine—which is practically identical to the commercial PW2000 engine—was developed entirely by Pratt & Whitney and its commercial partners. This alone saved the Government over \$1.5 billion. Additionally, none of the cost overruns or production problems have resulted from the F117 engine.

To stop the program now would mean the loss of another 200 to 300 jobs in Middletown. In an area that has been hard hit by the downsizing of the defense and insurance industries and where Pratt alone has laid-off 6,700 employees during the past year, the cancellation of the C-17 program would be devastating.

In closing, I ask that my colleagues do what makes the most economic and

military sense, vote for the Harman amendment and oppose the Furse amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, in making the decision about how to vote on this bill, whether my colleagues vote for six C-17's or four C-17's and four nondevelopmental types of aircraft, consider the words of Colin Powell when he said,

Our military strategy is changing from a focus on global war to a focus on regional crisis. And to deal with those kinds of crises, you have got to get there fast, and you have to get there with the mostest.

And he said,

That is what the C-17 will do for us.

I think he said that for three reasons. I think he said it, first, because it obviously increases lift, outsized lift, oversized lift, and personnel lift.

Second, it keeps the unit price lower. To do four C-17's instead of six C-17's, it increases the price per unit from \$30 to \$40 million.

Third, it requires the contractor to prove they can produce, prove that they can produce the product on time and of the quality that is necessary in the number that is necessary to get the job done.

Finally, I would conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying this: Dick Cheney not long ago was quoted as saying, "The C-17 is an absolutely vital strategic asset, regardless of what size force we have in the long run."

I urge my colleagues to support the Harman amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize a point I made earlier in the general debate. Whatever your view of American's military strategy ought to be, whether you are content with the drawdown we are having now or not, you have to support increased additional lift. As we draw down the forces, we end up with a smaller force based in the United States. If you want to be able to do anything in the world, peacekeeping, protection of American interests, we have got to get those forces abroad. We cannot do that without the C-17. Whatever your perspective on the overall military strategy, you need to support the Harman amendment for six C-17's.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Harman-Horn amendment for three reasons.

First, we need the airlift capability and flexibility the C-17 provides. According to Former Defense Secretary

Dick Cheney, the C-17 is "an absolutely vital strategic asset regardless of what size force we have in the long term." This state-of-the-art aircraft can carry outside cargo to small, remote airfields, giving us a strategic advantage in rapid development capability to meet regional threats. President Clinton agrees, and I support his modest request for funding.

Second, we saved billions of dollars in development costs on the C-17's Pratt & Whitney engines because the manufacturer developed it for commercial use on the Boeing 757 at a cost of \$1½ billion. The engine has over 6 million hours of experience on commercial aircraft and is 5 to 7 percent more fuel efficient than its closest competitor. The Air Force has saved taxpayers billions in R&D costs by using off-the-shelf, state-of-the-art commercial engines.

Third, while the impact of canceling the C-17 program would cost 200 to 300 jobs in Connecticut alone, the total employment impact would be far worse, as many as 10,000 jobs nationwide. Such economic dislocation on top of what we've already experienced in the past four years would be tragic under any circumstances, but it would be unconscionable to cause it by terminating a necessary and successful program that is fundamental to our military readiness according to Democratic and Republican administrations.

I encourage members to check all the facts before you take the reckless plunge over the cliff and dismantle a critical component of our national security. The C-17 is important and has already proven its worth in the field, and I urge you to support the Harman-Horn-McCurdy-Saxton-Spratt-E.B. Johnson amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying among military people that amateurs talk about strategy, but professionals talk about logistics, and how quickly and efficiently an army gets military supplies and equipment from here to there determines whether or not strategic plans can be implemented.

In today's high technology, high pressure battlefield, the army that gets there "fustest with the mostest" wins, and the C-17 can certainly help us do that.

The amendment gives the House the chance to restore the C-17 program back to the budget request of six aircraft without increasing the deficit.

My understanding is certainly the administration supports the amendment. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shalikashvili, supports it. The former Joint Chiefs Chairman Colin Powell supports it.

□ 1620

The gentleman from New Jersey quoted Defense Secretary Cheney, who was in my district last night for a big event and reaffirmed again his strong belief in the program. All senior military leaders and field commanders cite the need for the C-47 and the airlift capability it provides.

But the most important endorsement comes from the 20-year-olds whose lives on the battlefield depend on being supplied quickly with the right equipment. As a former combat infantryman, I can tell my colleagues that fighting forces that are supplied with the equipment that they need when they need it get a boost, a big boost in morale as well as an edge in combat.

The C-17 can carry not only outsized equipment, it can carry hope to our troops because it delivers the goods when and where they need it.

One of the arguments raised in favor of the amendment, of course, is that it reduces cost per unit. Naturally, there is no question about that. But I want to remind our colleagues that six C-17's can contribute to reducing the cost in lives per military unit on the battlefield. That is the reduction that counts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], who is on the other side of this issue but is constrained by time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Frankly, I wanted to rise simply to express my deep appreciation for my colleague and the professional way he is handling this matter. We do disagree on a specific. That is, the increased numbers of six and eight in the out-years. This amendment will, in turn, reduce the cost for aircraft \$40 million to \$50 million a year. It will also save 8,000 jobs in California, which is very important to all of us.

This is the technology we need now. It is the airlift of the future. We must be able to project our force throughout the world without having our troops dispersed throughout the world.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me and expect passage of this amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Harmon amendment.

Back in 1986, the good old Heritage Foundation, a good, conservative think-tank, issued a report dated January 23, 1986, which I think summarizes my philosophy about the flawed C-17 program.

It came to the conclusion that:

A careful analysis by experts of U.S. airlift needs and of the C-17 program reveals that a new cargo plane is not needed to close the gap. As such, the Air Force should cancel the C-17, now in a full-scale engineering phase of development, and instead build more C-5B cargo and KC-10 cargo tanker aircraft. Better use, moreover, should be made of the existing fleet of C-130 Hercules and C-141B Starlifter strategic aircraft. Not only could this save about \$20 billion, but the U.S. would have the needed planes available much sooner.

Let me address one other issue that was raised by the Heritage, good, conservative Republican think-tank, report. It said that the idea of using the C-17 to go to the far edge of the battle area, the FEBA, as it was known, was absolutely ridiculous because "Is it realistic to expect the Air Force to risk the C-17, which may cost \$180 million or more each," and, of course, that is up now to about \$250 million or more, "on austere airfields in or near combat zones? Former Air Force Secretary Bernon Orr apparently does not think so. As he said in 1982, 'my worry is that with a very large expensive plane like the C-17 and a limited number of them, the forward commander may not want to order them up to the edge of the battle area.'"

Mr. Chairman, in 1987, when I was a Member of the House and a member of the Committee on Armed Services and before I had two children in college and could afford certain extras in life, I ordered and purchased at my own expense these paper airplanes to be sent to each and every Member of the House of Representatives on which it says that the C-17 is a \$40 billion boondoggle and, according to my friend, Ed Jenkins, nothing but a town car for the Air Force.

Well, I hate to say, and it really bothers me to say, Mr. Chairman, "I told you so," but, folks, we told you so.

We have thrown away now billions of dollars. We still do not have any capability. Let us not further compound the mistake. Let us put an end to this foolishness. Let us try to do something for the taxpayer here today and vote down overwhelmingly the Harmon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following information.

CLOSING THE MILITARY AIRLIFT GAP INTRODUCTION

Should a crisis develop in Europe or the Mideast, it would take the U.S. 483 C-5 and 1,558 C-141B cargo plane loads to rush the 24th Mechanized Infantry Division—with its 16,800 troops, 290 tanks, 430 armored fighting vehicles, 124 helicopters, 780 combat support vehicles, 3,580 trucks and other equipment—from its base in Fort Stewart, Georgia, to the trouble spot within the prescribed ten days. To support Europe alone, the U.S. would have to transport six such Army divisions, 60 tactical fighter squadrons, and one Marine Amphibious Brigade to Western Europe.

In the event of such demands, the U.S. does not have enough cargo planes to speed its

forces to distant battlefields. This strategic airlift gap is one of the American arsenal's most serious weaknesses. That the U.S. needs more airlift capability is widely accepted. At issue, however, is whether the Air Force's \$39.8 billion Airlift Master Plan is the best way to close the gap. By designating a new generation of cargo airplane, the McDonnell Douglas C-17, as the Plan's centerpiece, the Pentagon may be making a serious and costly error.

The Air Force Plan suffers from two fundamental flaws: 1) it underutilizes aircraft already in the airlift fleet as well as such proposed plans as the Lockheed C-5B, which could be produced sooner and at a significantly lower acquisition cost than the C-17's \$180 million each; 2) it rests on questionable operational and planning assumptions, such as using the C-17 for both tactical and strategic airlift missions.

Careful analysis by experts of U.S. airlift needs and of the C-17 program reveals that a new cargo plane is not needed to close the gap. As such, the Air Force should cancel the C-17, now in a full-scale engineering phase of development, and instead, build more C-5B cargo and KC-10 cargo tanker aircraft. Better use, moreover, should be made of the existing fleet of C-130 "Hercules" and C-141B "Starlifter" strategic aircraft. Not only could this save about \$20 billion, but the U.S. would have the needed planes available much sooner.

STRATEGIC AIRLIFT AND U.S. MOBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Strategic airlift is used primarily for the rapid deployment of forces, military equipment, and supplies to combat zones in the early stage of wars. Without the prepositioned military equipment that exists for example, in Europe and Korea, most U.S. military contingencies in the Third World would require rapid air transport of men and materiel to the combat zone. Transport by sea is indispensable for sustaining combat an average 30 days or longer, but it is often too slow to reach the combat zone for violent regional conflicts decided very quickly.

The standard categories of airlift military cargoes are: 1) bulk, such as fuel, ammunition, and other cargo that when loaded on pallets can be carried by most airlifters; 2) oversize, such as trucks and towed artillery pieces that fit into all military cargo planes (C-5, C-141, C-130, and KC-10) and some specially designed civilian aircraft; and 3) outsize, such as main battle tanks, helicopters, and other extremely large items that can be placed only in the huge C-5 or the proposed C-17 cargo planes.

The principal aircraft in the Air Force's airlift fleet are its 70 C-5 "Galaxy" and 234 C-141 "Starlifter" strategic airlifters, 16 KC-10 dual-capable cargo/tanker aircraft, and 512 C-130 "Hercules" tactical airlifters. The C-5A jet and its newer modified version, the C-5B, carry outsize cargo such as tanks and helicopters over intercontinental distances. The C-141, the workhorse strategic airlifter of the Military Airlift Command, carries a substantial volume of cargo over unlimited ranges with in-flight refueling. The prop-jet C-130, on the other hand, is the mainstay of the tactical airlift fleet, operating within combat theaters and carrying troops and cargo 100 to 2,000 miles. When modified, it can refuel helicopters and fighter planes, perform as an aerial gunship, airborne command post, or airborne communication center. The KC-10 is essentially the three-engine McDonnell Douglas DC-10 long-range aircraft capable of carrying cargo and refueling other aircraft.¹

SHORTFALLS IN STRATEGIC AIRLIFT

In the late 1970s, the possibility that the U.S. would have to defend its interests in the Persian Gulf renewed interest in strategic mobility. A congressional request that the Pentagon review strategic mobility requirements led to the Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study (CMMS).² In 1981, the study concluded that the U.S. was woefully short of cargo planes, ships, and military equipment prepositioned abroad. The study recommended that the U.S. be able to airlift 66 million-ton-miles-per-day (MTM/D) to meet its global commitments. Currently, the U.S. has a 43 MTM/D capability.³

Even this vastly underestimates U.S. requirements. In 1980, the Joint Chiefs of Staff concluded that a 150 MTM/D airlift capability would be desirable just for reinforcing U.S. troops in Europe.

Simultaneous wars in Europe and the Persian Gulf, or Europe and Korea, are thus far beyond U.S. airlift capabilities. Even the CMMS goal of 66 MTM/D, which will not be met until the late 1990s, is the absolute minimum of what is required.⁴

THE AIR FORCE AIRLIFT MASTER PLAN

Even before the CMMS was completed, the Air Force developed plans for a totally new long-range or strategic cargo plane to supplement the 1960s vintage C-5 and replace C-141s and C-130s. The capabilities of the C-X, as the design model was called, were determined before the CMMS was completed.⁵ The Air Force Airlift Master Plan required a plane to have both intercontinental range and the "mission flexibility" to land at small, hard-to-land-on airfields in or near combat zones. Proposed airlift characteristics included short landing and departure approaches for tactical operations and the capability to convert back and forth between cargo, troop, and aeromedical evacuation configurations. The new plane should be capable of aerial refueling and of carrying such outsize cargo as tanks and helicopters. The C-X, therefore, was to be a hybrid cargo lifter. Its mission was to be a cross between intercontinental and intratheater tasks traditionally accomplished by two different airplanes.

In 1983 the Air Force concluded that the C-17 would meet these requirements. The following year, in the Airlift Master Plan, and the Airlift Total Force Plan, the Air Force decided to:⁶

1. Build a strategic airlift force to meet the Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study goal of 66 million-ton-miles-per-day airlift capability.
2. Double tactical airlift capability.
3. Buy 210 C-17s, using 30 for training and backup.
4. Retire 180 C-130 "Hercules" short-range tactical airlifters.
5. Retire 54 C-141 "Starlifter" long-range cargo planes and transfer the remaining 180 Starlifters to the reserves where their use rate and wartime capability will be lower.
6. Use C-17 short-range or "intratheater" shuttles to replace the retired C-130 planes and to augment tactical airlift capability by almost 80 percent.

Before the Air Force issued the Airlift Master Plan, the Department of Defense already had decided to increase airlift capability in the near term. Its plan of January 1982 called for buying an additional 50 C-5Bs, 44 KC-10 fuel tanker aircraft, and 19 converted Boeing 747s for troop transport.⁷ The principal reason that these aircraft were bought was that they would be available significantly earlier than the C-17.

U.S. CARGO AIRLIFT CAPABILITY

Aircraft	Number operational	Air Force plans to meet airlift goals
C-5	70	Purchase 50 C-5Bs
C-141	234	Retire 54 Move 180 to reserves at one-half current operating rate
C-130	512	Retire 180
C-17		Purchase 210
KC-10	116	² Purchase 44
CRAF Wide Body Cargo ³	39	Modify 19 747s

¹ 16 KC-10s assigned to Strategic Air Command.
² 44 additional KC-10s to be added to Strategic Air Command fleet but dedicated to airlift use.

³ Civilian Reserve Air Fleet for transporting cargo on modified passenger planes in times of national emergency.

Source: Military Airlift Command, United States Air Force.

The Air Force claims that the C-17 program is the most economical option it examined. Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Tom Cooper states: "The acquisition of 210 C-17s would cost \$16 billion less and require nearly 15,000 fewer personnel to operate when compared to alternatives based on the C-5 that provide equivalent capability."⁸ The savings will come from the lower manpower and operational costs of the C-17. Savings will also accrue from the retirement of 180 C-130s and from transferring 180 C-141Bs into the reserves at a lower operating level, which will cut down on active duty manpower and operational costs.

PROBLEMS WITH THE AIRLIFT MASTER PLAN

The Air Force should be applauded for trying to come to terms with the perennial problem of airlift shortfalls. But its way of going about it raises serious questions. Among them:

1. Is a new generation strategic airlifter necessary? Under Air Force plans, the C-5 air cargo plane will remain in service along with the C-17 well beyond the year 2000. Is there really a need for a new strategic airlifter if the current model, the C-5B, has enough productive years left to be retained in the inventory for that long a period?

2. The dual-capability dilemma: A key element of the Air Force plan is the capability of the C-17 to deliver troops, supplies, and military equipment not only over vast distances but directly to combat forces at the forward edge of the battlefield. This will be essential mainly because the Air Force plan would retire 180 C-130 Hercules from the fleet of 512 tactical airlift aircraft. The C-17 is supposed to fly tactical air sorties between strategic airlift missions.

In a major war, however, it is questionable whether the new and expensive C-17 will be available for tactical combat support roles. Presumably, it will be flying intercontinental sorties across the Pacific or North Atlantic. Even if the plane were available, some experts see problems with a hybrid design that equips the C-17 for both strategic and tactical airlift missions.

3. Battlefield vulnerabilities: Is it realistic to expect the Air Force to risk the C-17, which may cost \$180 million or more each, on "austere" airfields in or near combat zones? Former Air Force Secretary Vernon Orr apparently does not think so. As he said in 1982, "... my worry . . . is that with a very large expensive plane like the C-17 and a limited number of them, the forward commander may not want to order them up to the edge of the battle area."⁹

This problem of the vulnerability of a large, expensive, and valuable strategic carrier plagued the 1983 U.S. military operation in Grenada. Explaining why air cargo sorties were backed up, Colonel Dave Starling, now a commander of the Army's 18th Airborne Corps Support Command, said: "Initially there was concern that the [cargo] aircraft was susceptible to gunfire and, if one got hit, we'd have really been up a creek."¹⁰ "Aircraft were stacked up to the ionosphere," another commander said, who added that lift operations might have been terminated had the enemy had longer range anti-aircraft guns.¹¹

4. Cost: the estimated acquisition cost for the Airlift Master Plan is \$39.8 billion, of which \$37.2 billion is for the C-17. In its own terms, the C-17's price may be reasonable for the research, development, and production of a plane using the latest aviation technology. But whether this plane is reasonable for the allotted task is another matter. To be sure, the Air Force claims that its plan will be \$16 billion less than alternatives based on the C-5. Yet by some calculations, adding 101 C-5Bs to the fleet to meet the Pentagon's goal of 66 MTM/D airlift capability would cost at most \$16.8 billion.¹² And this is at an inflated "then-year" dollar cost computed to reflect price hikes during the aircraft's production life. Yet this is still far below the then-year \$37.2 billion acquisition cost for the C-17. Anticipated economies in producing a plane that has been in production for some time, moreover, could reduce the total acquisition cost of 101 C-5Bs to \$14 billion.

Greater savings will come from not retiring the C-141s and C-130s as required by the Air Force Plan. While it is true that the C-141s will have to be replaced some day, their service life can be extended to help meet strategic airlift requirements at a lower cost until 1998. In this time, the Air Force can develop and deploy a follow-on tactical airlifter to replace the C-130. By extending the service life of the "work horse" C-141B at a cost of about \$300 million, the Air Force could keep 180 of these aircraft in active status, and not, as is currently planned, transfer them to the reserves.¹³ Cost there may be considerably lower, but readiness is also.

The savings from building more C-5Bs instead of C-17s will enable the Air Force to keep the C-130 in operation. The 180 of these aircraft currently marked for retirement could be kept in service until a new short-range tactical airlifter is developed and produced. Keeping the C-130 in the air would safeguard the Air Force's tactical airlift mission. It would ensure that there are enough short-range airlifters to perform the many tactical airlift missions for which an expensive and essential strategic airlift cargo plane like the C-17 may either be unavailable or overqualified.

Many experts argue, in fact, that a new tactical airlifter to replace the C-130 is needed far more than a new long-range air cargo plane like the C-17. Said Lt. General William Richardson, former Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans: "The C-17 is not the 'solution'—there will always be a need for a smaller, STOL (short take-off and landing) aircraft that is technologically superior to the C-130."¹⁴

It is true that the C-17, with a minimum crew size of three and low maintenance personnel requirements, will demand less manpower than the C-5B, which has a minimum crew size of seven or eight. Decreasing manpower adds to savings. The Air Force claims that the C-17 option will require 15,000 fewer personnel than the C-5 option. This accounts

for some of the alleged savings of the C-17 approach.

But the major portion of the Air Force projections for C-17 savings comes not from C-17 operating and manpower economies but from the cut in maintenance, operations, and manpower costs if the C-141s and C-130s are retired. It makes little economic sense, however, to purchase a new type of aircraft to replace old ones when much of the existing fleet is still capable of longer service at a relatively low cost.

THE C-5 VS. THE C-17: TECHNICAL ISSUES

There are a number of technical issues involving the relative merits of the C-17 or C-5 option. Among them:

1. Design and Operational Concepts: Some critics of the C-17 argue that the design and operational concepts for the C-17 and C-5 are remarkably similar. The C-17 probably has a capability advantage at the tactical airlift end of the mission spectrum, while the C-5 has the advantage at the strategic end.¹⁵

2. Availability of Airfields: The C-5B requires runways 4,000 feet long and 150 feet wide for landing.¹⁶ But Lockheed Corporation the manufacturer of the C-5B, claims that recent tests of the wing-modified C-5A demonstrate the ability of the C-5A and C-5B to land on runways only 3,000 feet in length.¹⁷ The design requirement for the C-17, on the other hand, is the capability to land on runways 90 feet wide and as short as 3,000 feet.¹⁸ Even if the C-5B still needs 4,000 feet to land, operationally it barely will be at a disadvantage compared to the C-17. The reason: only a tiny fraction of airfields in Europe, Northeast Asia (Korea and Japan), and Southwest Asia are between 3,000 and 4,000 feet long and thus can accommodate the C-17 but not the C-5.¹⁹ In Central America, however, three-quarters of all airfields are shorter than 3,000 feet and thus can handle neither the C-17 nor the C-5B. This is the case in many other Third World countries.²⁰

3. Airfield Congestion and Obstacles: A major Air Force argument for the C-17 is that because it is smaller than C-5B, it is less likely to cause congestion at airfields during operations. This is undoubtedly true. Yet because the larger C-5B delivers more cargo than the C-17 (261,000 lbs. vs. 172,200 lbs.), fewer C-5Bs than C-17s will be needed to deliver the same load, thus decreasing congestion. Backups are cut even further by the C-5s because their front and rear loading doors allow them to move in and out of the airports quickly.

It is argued that trees, fences, and other obstacles at the periphery of some narrow airfields in Europe can hinder C-5B access because of its broad wingspan (228 feet compared to 165 feet for the C-17 and 195 feet for a Boeing 747 commercial jet). Trees and fences, however, can be removed quickly. Preparing European airfields, and when necessary, non-European allied airfields, for better use by the C-5B is no major undertaking.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND PROPOSALS

The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings budget balancing bill is going to force careful examination of all federal spending. The Air Force thus needs an airlift-enhancement program that can be sold to Congress as cost effective. If the program cannot be sold, the entire effort to narrow and close the airlift gap could be jeopardized. All airlift-enhancement proposals should be constructed to get the most military capability for the money spent. The guiding principle should be to establish the strategic and military operational priorities for the program, and then to find the most economical way to meet these priorities.

To do so, the Air Force should:

1. Retain the Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study goal of 66 million-ton-miles-per day of airlift requirements. There is a broad consensus behind this number. More capability may be needed in the future, but the 66 MTM/D goal appears adequate for the purposes of an affordable airlift program.

2. Cancel the C-17 program, build more C-5Bs and KC-10s, and retire no C-130s.

3. Retire and transfer no C-141s. Keep all 234 of them in the active force by modifying them to extend their service life. The entire C-141B fleet of 271 airplanes can be extended 15 years for about \$300 million.

4. Consider developing a new short-range "tactical" airlifter to replace the C-130. The Air Force will now know more about this need after the completion sometime this fall of the Pentagon's Worldwide Intratheater Mobility Study (WIMS), which will include an analysis of future U.S. tactical airlift requirements.²¹ Because the U.S. needs a robust tactical airlift capability, the current force of over 512 C-130s should be kept in place until a follow-up tactical airlift is deployed to take its place. To do so, a service life extension program will be required for the C-130.

For the United States, whose military obligations are spread across thousands of miles, the ability to fly troops, supplies, and military equipment over great distances is absolutely indispensable to its global strategy. The U.S. now suffers from an airlift gap—and it must be closed. Yet the Air Force's proposed new generation cargo plane, the C-17, and the Airlift Master Plan are not the way to proceed. The Administration should buy more C-5Bs instead of C-17s, while moving rapidly to begin the development of a new generation short-range tactical airlifter.—Kim R. Holmes, Ph.D., Policy Analyst.

FOOTNOTES

1. Information provided by U.S. Air Force Military Airlift Command.

2. Final Report, Congressionally Mandated Mobility Study, Department of Defense, May 1981.

3. U.S. Air Force Airlift Master Plan (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Air Force, 1983), p. III-5. The million-ton-miles-per-day (MTM/D) standard measure of capability combines the amount of cargo moved (tons), the distance to be moved (miles), and the time within which the movement is to be completed (days). A follow-on study, Saber Challenge Lift, recommended that at least half of the recommended 20 MTM/D additional airlift capability be for outside cargo such as tanks and helicopters. The study recommended, moreover, that fast sealift capabilities be * * * ed, *ibid.*

4. Airlift Master Plan, p. III-5.

5. U.S. General Accounting Office, "The Department of Defense Should Resolve Certain Issues Concerning the C-X Aircraft before Requesting Proposals from Industry for Its Full-Scale Engineering Development (PSAD-81-B), Washington, D.C., October 10, 1980.

6. See Airlift Master Plan, pp. V-8-9.

7. The C-5B is a modified version of the C-5A. Modifications include a new engine (the General Electric TF-39-1C), new wings, modernized avionics, and a fuselage structure constructed from an aluminum alloy less conducive to corrosion.

8. Hearings, Subcommittee on Sea Power and Force Projection, U.S. Senate, March 7, 1985.

9. Military Technology, Interview, August 1982, p. 87.

10. Military Logistics Forum, July/August 1985, p. 23.

11. *Ibid.*

12. This figure is based on a Lockheed fixed unit price proposal of around \$100 million a copy (in 1984 dollars), which includes Air Force add-on costs. The total then-year cost is derived from a Selective Acquisition Report estimate of \$8.4 billion for 50 C-5Bs in then-year dollars. This puts the unit cost of a C-5B at \$168 million for a program funded over the FY 1983-FY 1987 period. Adjusting for lower expected inflation results in all estimated then-year cost of \$155

million a copy for the C-5B, which compares favorably with \$180 million a unit for the C-17. Selective Acquisition Report, Department of Defense, September 30, 1985.

13. Information provided by Lockheed Corporation. It includes cost of extending service life of C-141 from 45,000 hours to 60,000 hours.

14. "Army Operations Chief Says He's Tired of USAF's C-17," Defense Week, February 14, 1983, p. 3.

15. For a more complete comparison, see Jeffrey Record, U.S. Strategic Airlift: Requirements and Capabilities (Cambridge, Massachusetts and Washington, D.C.: Institute Foreign Policy Analysis, 1985), Appendix B.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 44. Information also provided by U.S. Air Force, Military Airlift Command, Scott Air Force Base.

17. Record, op. cit., p. 29. Lockheed Corporation claims that the C-5 can operate on dirt runways as well.

18. Air Force, Military Airlift Command.

19. Record, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

20. As for the C-5B's wider runway requirement, it would be more cost effective to widen runways by pouring more concrete or laying metal planks to handle the C-5B's 150 feet runway width requirement than to buy the C-17.

21. The fact that no current or planned strategic airlifter can operate on three-quarters of the airfields in Central America is a powerful argument in favor of developing a new tactical airlifter which can.

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

Mr. Chairman, to summarize, our bipartisan amendment reflects a position most of us were not prepared to endorse in the Armed Services Committee, because we did not have adequate information from the Defense Department. That information was made available shortly after our mark, and thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], we were able to consider it.

Now an overwhelming bipartisan majority of the Committee on Armed Services supports the Harman amendment.

Let me underscore again that the cost of the Harman amendment and the cost of the committee mark are identical. The only issue is, how we spend that money. DOD has told us convincingly that it needs and can manage a program for 6 C-17s and that it would not know how to spend money and purchase four nondevelopmental aircraft, a part of the committee proposal. We who support this amendment believe that we are spending it in the wisest possible way, and I ask for your support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] to close debate.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, let me just make a few wrap-up points.

First of all, as to how many airplanes we buy because, as the chairman said, we have two well-considered choices before us. The committee's version right now would have us buy four a year. The Department of Defense says that will foreordain the result, because the cost will be so expensive, so inordinate at four a year, that trickling rate, that the price itself will cause us to quit the program.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

It just makes common sense to me to vote this amendment. The Pentagon and the company involved have been working on this vociferously for some time. They have reached an agreement. Let us honor that agreement and let us find out if we can produce this plane at a reasonable cost.

If we cannot, then we will decide that. But if we can, we save the \$15 billion that we have already spent that we would lose if we terminate this program and do not honor that agreement.

Let us honor that contract. It is the only sensible thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from California [Ms. HARMAN] has expired.

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

Let me simply say, we have two proposals, the committee proposition and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

What we attempted to do was not to say four in perpetuity. We said over the next 2 years, for each year for 2 years and then make a judgment.

The amendment says six this year, eight next year. Remember, this only works in the context of the settlement. The settlement has not been dealt with.

I would suggest to Members that this is where the real contentious issues and contentious arguments really are going to fall.

Whether Members fall on their swords about four or six, that is not the most compelling issue here. This only makes sense within the framework of the settlement.

We have to face up to that. My colleagues ought to make a judgment. I ask them to stay with the House and with the position articulated by the House Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Harman amendment, and in support of the C-17. Our military experience during the past few years points to the clear need for a strong airlift capability. It is a question of strategic necessity; of logistics; and of saving lives.

Recent history has taught us that we may need, at any time, to put U.S. forces in distant places, quickly, with the right equipment. The effectiveness of our troops and their ability to perform their mission depends on the right equipment. More importantly, so does their safety. That is why we need the C-17.

Examples of where we could have used the C-17's enormous capabilities are numerous, and the names familiar: Mogadishu, Sarajevo, Desert Storm. In Mogadishu, we could have doubled the amount of equipment we delivered in support of our troops and for humanitarian aid with the C-17. The consequences of not having this capability are clear: Time and lives can be lost.

According to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the C-17 is the only aircraft for

this job. It delivers four times the payload of the C-130; it can land at small airfields that cannot be used by current U.S. military transport planes; it can discharge its payloads quickly; and it can fly much further than other military transport planes.

This is a controversial plane. No question. But the controversy is about the program, not the need. The program has been cleaned up, at no cost to American taxpayers. But the need is still with us—perhaps now more than ever.

We must support our fighting men and women. Let us make sure they have the best support, the best logistics, and access to all the equipment they need to do the job—no matter where they are. Support our troops and the dangerous work they do. Support the C-17.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the bipartisan Harman-Horn-McCurdy-Saxton-Spratt-Johnson-Talent amendment which will increase the number of C-17 transport aircraft authorized in the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1995 from four to six and provide funds for eight aircraft in long lead procurement. The C-17 is the cornerstone of our airlift modernization program to replace older aircraft now nearing the end of their useful life. The Harman amendment restores President Clinton's original budget request funding level, and keeps our airlift modernization program on schedule.

The C-17 is an essential air transport program that is designed to meet our Nation's airlift needs well into the 21st century. Defense Secretary William Perry recently said:

Our Nation has a critical need for inter-theater airlift modernization if we are to maintain our ability to project forces and respond to humanitarian missions worldwide. Our C-141 aircraft are wearing out. The C-17 aircraft continues to be the most cost-effective means to meet current and projected airlift requirements. The C-17's ability to deliver outside cargo, combined with its special capability to use austere fields, will provide us with modern, highly capable strategic airlift.

The characteristics of the C-17 far outweigh those of other aircraft including the C-5 and the C-141. The C-17 can land on shorter runways and is more maneuverable on the ground than the larger C-5 that requires excessively long and wide runways. In many developing countries and remote areas where we are witnessing small, contingent conflicts, the C-5 is too large to be deployed. The C-141, on the other hand, cannot carry critical outsized cargo such as tanks, helicopters, and large vehicles and artillery. Canceling the C-17 or limiting its production will not solve the problem of aging aircraft now in service, such as the C-141. For example, Army units deployed to Panama in 1989 were carried entirely by air, and United States airlift assets were totally employed. The massive military airlift to the Persian Gulf during the Persian Gulf war put heavy additional stress on certain models of C-141's and probably shortened their remaining service life. If our Nation is to remain a world power, we need a reliable and dependable airlift to carry troops, supplies and system weapons, as well as humanitarian supplies during major disasters.

Many of my colleagues may argue that this program is over-budgeted. As a member of

the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, I believe that controlling cost on weapons programs is critical. The House Armed Services Committee, Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, and the Air Force have placed firm conditions on the C-17 aircraft program to reduce the overall costs, and ensure that it is cost efficient and meets the Air Force's performance requirements. Reducing the production rate from six aircraft to four aircraft would dramatically undercut the Department of Defense's strategy to control costs on the C-17, and possibly make it unaffordable. Any further reduction in the C-17 production rate would drastically increase the annual unit costs of this program by \$40 to \$50 million. We cannot afford to keep scaling back programs like the C-17 and still make this program affordable. In addition, we must hold the contractor accountable and demand that the aircraft is operational and manufacturing inefficiencies are corrected.

Over the years, we have invested \$15.8 billion in the C-17 transport program. By purchasing 6 aircraft in fiscal year 1995 and 8 of them in fiscal year 1996, the Air Force may round out its buy to what it calls a minimum viable force of 40 airplanes. And, with 40 C-17's, the Air Force can satisfy the minimum requirements for outside cargo capacity.

The Harman amendment will also fully fund the Air Force's request to try out nondevelopmental aircraft such as the 747's or newly produced C5B's. The procurement of nondevelopmental aircraft is still an open option for the Air Force.

There is another key issue that I want to raise today, and that is jobs. My State of California, and Los Angeles County in particular, has been exceptionally hard hit by defense downsizing and layoffs. There are over 10,000 Californians employed by the prime contractor on this defense program, and 8,000 California subcontractors. In March of this year, California's unemployment rate reached 8.6 percent—2.1 percent higher than the national average of 6.5 percent. During the same period, Los Angeles County's unemployment was 9.4 percent—among the highest in the Nation. We can ill-afford to lose more jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment today restores funding for this vital program that is not only important to the Los Angeles area, but to the Nation as well. With broad-based bipartisan support, I am pleased to join my colleagues in casting my vote for the Harman-Horn-McCurdy-Saxton-Spratt-Johnson-Talent amendment to the defense authorization bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, while I have concerns about the C-17 program, Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch and Secretary of Defense William Perry have addressed them, and so I rise today in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues from California, Ms. HARMAN and Mr. HORN. As I am sure my colleagues are aware, this amendment would provide the authorization for full funding for six C-17 aircraft for fiscal year 1995, as well as long lead funding for eight aircraft in fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, the C-17 aircraft will meet the increasingly changing needs of the U.S. military in the post-cold war era. As demonstrated by the Desert Storm operation, there is a necessity for the military to be able to

quickly transport combat power directly to the front line. According to General Gordon Sullivan, Army Chief of Staff, "Today there is only one alternative that can meet the requirements of a core airlifter—the C-17."

Mr. Chairman, the C-17's capabilities are crucial to the Air Force's ability to deliver and sustain forces in support of theatre commanders. The C-17 can carry outsize cargo to give early forces firepower; it can deliver its cargo into remote locations with short runways; and it has the ability to airdrop heavy equipment, supplies, and troops.

The importance of the C-17 aircraft has been recognized by the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Each has gone on record supporting the restoration of the budget request for six C-17's in fiscal year 1995.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to register my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentlelady from Oregon [Ms. FURSE]. The Furse amendment flies in the face of every recommendation from the senior commanders of the U.S. military. More importantly, the Furse amendment will do nothing but waste resources and eliminate jobs. If the Furse amendment is agreed to, a projected 8,000 layoffs will occur over the next 2 years. A vote for the Furse amendment is a vote against jobs, a vote against the American worker.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Harman amendment. Supporting the C-17 is the right thing to do.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Chairman, allow me to first of all commend Chairman DELLUMS for his hard work in crafting the fiscal year 1995 Defense authorization bill and moving it to the floor so expeditiously.

I particularly applaud the Chairman for convening a recent hearing on C-17 procurement to get the facts out on the program. And it is this important issue that I would like to comment on today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my strong support to the Harman amendment to restore funds for the C-17 program.

There is little debate about the vital need to modernize our military's lift capability. The question revolves around how best to meet that need.

Among our Nation's top civilian and military experts, the answer to that question is clear. The C-17—and only the C-17—meets the high demands and the core strategic airlift requirements for our forces in the post-Cold War era.

It is the only transport aircraft that meets these demands today and into the future.

Mr. Chairman, the C-17 program has undergone program improvements over the last year. In fact, it has met all of the mandates set out in last year's defense authorization bill. Efficiency is going up, costs are going down.

We should not penalize the C-17 program for meeting the goals we have set. We should not phase out this program which has the unified support of our military and civilian leadership. We should not turn our backs on a \$15.8 billion investment that American taxpayers have already made.

The need for the strategic airlift capability represented by the C-17 is critical and it is

growing. As regional crises erupt across the globe and our own forces are drawn down, only the C-17 offers the unique ability to deliver outsized cargo such as tanks and helicopters to austere environments.

According to the DOD's Cost and Operational Effectiveness Analysis, the C-17 is the most cost-effective solution to filling a clear and compelling need.

The C-17 program is a critical element to U.S. defense modernization in our changing world. It is also vital to thousands of people in Missouri and elsewhere who are working hard to produce a quality product for our Nation's Armed Forces at an affordable price.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to approve the Harman amendment, reject the Furse amendment, and restore full funding for six C-17 aircraft.

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Harman amendment to the Department of Defense [DOD] authorization bill (H.R. 4301) to increase the number of C-17 transport aircraft authorized in the bill from four to six.

The increased number of C-17's represents what was included in the President's fiscal year 1995 budget request. Funds for the additional aircraft will be offset by reductions in other defense programs.

I fully recognize that the C-17 program has had its share of timetable and budgetary difficulties in the recent past. However, since the Congress voted in 1992 to require the Department of Defense to report to the Congress on the viability of terminating the project we have seen marked improvements to the management of the C-17 program.

There is no doubt that there remains much room for improvement. However, I believe that we should allow time for additional improvements—some of which have already been implemented—to take effect and to determine whether these improvements benefit the program's timeliness and cost-effectiveness. By placing the C-17 program on probation, while supporting the administration's request, we will send the DoD a signal that future congressional support for the C-17 program will depend upon the degree to which improvements have been made during the next year. Furthermore, this policy will ensure that we are not prematurely abandoning a technological development which could prove to be the most advantageous to our Nation's Armed Forces during future military contingencies.

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 330, noes 100, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—330

- | | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Ackerman | Everett | Lightfoot |
| Allard | Ewing | Lipinski |
| Andrews (ME) | Farr | Livingston |
| Andrews (NJ) | Fawell | Lloyd |
| Andrews (TX) | Fazio | Long |
| Archer | Fields (LA) | Lowe |
| Arney | Fields (TX) | Lucas |
| Bacchus (FL) | Filner | Machtley |
| Bachus (AL) | Fish | Manton |
| Baesler | Flake | Manzullo |
| Baker (CA) | Ford (MI) | Martinez |
| Baker (LA) | Ford (TN) | Matsui |
| Ballenger | Fowler | Mazzoli |
| Barrett (NE) | Franks (CT) | McCandless |
| Bartlett | Franks (NJ) | McCloskey |
| Barton | Frost | McCollum |
| Bateman | Gallegly | McCreery |
| Beilenson | Gallo | McCurdy |
| Bentley | Gejdenson | McDade |
| Bereuter | Gephardt | McHale |
| Berman | Geren | McHugh |
| Bevill | Gibbons | McInnis |
| Bilbray | Gilchrest | McKeon |
| Bilirakis | Gilman | McNulty |
| Bishop | Gingrich | Meek |
| Blackwell | Glickman | Menendez |
| Billey | Gonzalez | Meyers |
| Blute | Goodlatte | Mica |
| Boehlert | Gordon | Michel |
| Boehner | Goss | Mineta |
| Bonilla | Grams | Minge |
| Bonior | Green | Molinari |
| Borski | Greenwood | Mollohan |
| Boucher | Gunderson | Montgomery |
| Brewster | Hall (OH) | Moorehead |
| Brooks | Hall (TX) | Moran |
| Browder | Hamilton | Murphy |
| Brown (CA) | Hancock | Murtha |
| Brown (FL) | Hansen | Myers |
| Bryant | Harman | Neal (NC) |
| Bunning | Hastert | Oberstar |
| Burton | Hastings | Obey |
| Buyer | Hayes | Orton |
| Byrne | Hefley | Owens |
| Callahan | Hefner | Oxley |
| Calvert | Herger | Packard |
| Camp | Hilliard | Parker |
| Canady | Hinche | Pastor |
| Cardin | Hoagland | Paxon |
| Carr | Hobson | Payne (VA) |
| Castle | Hochbrueckner | Peterson (FL) |
| Chapman | Hoke | Peterson (MN) |
| Clay | Holden | Petri |
| Clayton | Houghton | Pickett |
| Clement | Hoyer | Pickle |
| Clinger | Huffington | Pombo |
| Clyburn | Hughes | Pomeroy |
| Coble | Hunter | Quillen |
| Coleman | Hutchinson | Quinn |
| Collins (GA) | Hutto | Rahall |
| Collins (IL) | Hyde | Ramstad |
| Collins (MI) | Inglis | Rangel |
| Combest | Inhofe | Ravenel |
| Condit | Istook | Reed |
| Cooper | Jacobs | Reynolds |
| Coppersmith | Jefferson | Richardson |
| Costello | Johnson (CT) | Roberts |
| Cox | Johnson (SD) | Roemer |
| Cramer | Johnson, E.B. | Rogers |
| Crane | Johnson, Sam | Rohrabacher |
| Crapo | Kanjorski | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Cunningham | Kaptur | Rostenkowski |
| Danner | Kennelly | Rowland |
| de la Garza | Kim | Royal-Allard |
| de Lugo (VI) | King | Royce |
| DeLauro | Klecza | Sabo |
| DeLay | Klink | Sangmeister |
| Derrick | Knollenberg | Santorum |
| Diaz-Balart | Kolbe | Sarpalius |
| Dickey | Kopetski | Sawyer |
| Dicks | Kyl | Saxton |
| Dixon | Lambert | Schenk |
| Dooley | Lancaster | Schiff |
| Doolittle | Lantos | Schumer |
| Dornan | LaRocco | Scott |
| Dreier | Laughlin | Serrano |
| Duncan | Lazio | Sharp |
| Dunn | Leach | Shaw |
| Durbin | Lehman | Shays |
| Edwards (TX) | Levin | Shuster |
| Ehlers | Levy | Sisisky |
| Emerson | Lewis (CA) | Skaggs |
| Engel | Lewis (FL) | Skeen |

Skelton	Tanner	Valentine
Slattery	Tauzin	Visclosky
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Volkmer
Smith (NJ)	Tejeda	Vucanovich
Smith (OR)	Thomas (CA)	Walsh
Smith (TX)	Thomas (WY)	Waters
Snowe	Thompson	Weldon
Solomon	Thornton	Wheat
Spence	Thurman	Whitten
Spratt	Torkildsen	Williams
Stearns	Torres	Wilson
Stenholm	Torricelli	Wise
Stump	Towns	Wolf
Stupak	Trafficant	Wynn
Sundquist	Tucker	Young (AK)
Swett	Underwood (GU)	Young (FL)
Talent	Upton	Zeliff

NOES—100

Abercrombie	Kildee	Poshard
Applegate	Kingston	Price (NC)
Barca	Klein	Pryce (OH)
Barcia	Klug	Regula
Becerra	Kreidler	Ridge
Brown (OH)	LaFalce	Rose
Cantwell	Lewis (GA)	Roth
Conyers	Linder	Roukema
Coyne	Maloney	Rush
Darden	Mann	Sanders
Deal	Margolies-	Schaefer
DeFazio	Mezvinsky	Schroeder
Dellums	Markey	Sensenbrenner
Deusch	McDermott	Shepherd
Dingell	McKinney	Slaughter
Edwards (CA)	McMillan	Smith (IA)
English	Meehan	Stark
Eshoo	Mfume	Stokes
Evans	Miller (CA)	Strickland
Fingerhut	Miller (FL)	Studds
Foglietta	Mink	Swift
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Synar
Furse	Morella	Taylor (MS)
Gekas	Nadler	Unsoeld
Gillmor	Neal (MA)	Velazquez
Gooding	Norton (DC)	Vento
Gutiérrez	Nussle	Walker
Hamburg	Olver	Watt
Hoekstra	Pallone	Waxman
Inlee	Payne (NJ)	Woolsey
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Wyden
Johnston	Penny	Yates
Kasich	Porter	Zimmer
Kennedy	Portman	

NOT VOTING—8

Barlow	Grandy	Romero-Barcelo
Barrett (WI)	Horn	(PR)
Faleomavaega	Ortiz	Washington
(AS)		

□ 1710

Mr. PALLONE and Mr. McMILLAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAROCCO). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention at this time to offer my C-17 amendment, but I would like to take a few moments to speak about that amendment and why I think it is still relevant. I believe that it would have provided more airlift sooner and done it cheaper. With my plan the airlift we need could have been provided for \$16 billion less than the Department

of Defense's plan. Mine would have provided for a total of 32 C-17's, and we would have got our remaining airlift that we need from commercial and military alternatives.

When any of us goes shopping, Mr. Chairman, we look for value, and defense spending is no different. We need to get the best value out of every defense dollar. But if we continue on an excessive and unnecessary course, the American taxpayers do not get value, they get soaked.

We have military needs that we cannot afford right now: Communities facing base closure, veterans health care in which we must spend our military dollars more wisely so we meet our needs. There are several concerns I would have addressed in my amendment.

One is jobs. I think people fail to realize that my alternative, Mr. Chairman, would have created thousands of jobs through a building of the Boeing 747, the Lockheed C-5 or the McDonnell Douglas MD-11. And then we must talk about military needs. If we spend all our airlift dollars on the C-17, we will not have enough money to replace our airlift needs when we lay down the C-141's.

Our shortfall, Mr. Chairman, is in bulk and oversize capability. Now the existing commercial wide body planes, such as the 747, the MD-11 or the DC-10 could provide that shortfall, and it seems to me that, if the shortfall is there, we should be providing it there, not putting it on into a C-17 program which does not provide our airlift.

Then there is another requirement we have been told about, and that is that the C-17 can land on austere fields. Well, I checked with the Department of Defense, and there is a report that states that the C-17 can land in only 5 percent more airfields than the C-5, and the C-5 can land on dirt, and the C-17 cannot. Our alternative wide body commercial and military planes can travel farther than the C-17 with much greater payloads.

I say to my colleagues, "If you take a payload of 75 tons, which the C-17 can carry, it can only go 2,000 miles. The C-5 with the same payload can go 3,000 miles. The MD-11, same payload, 3,800 miles. And the 747 gets 6,400 miles with the same payload." So, I think we get more with my amendment of 32 C-17's and the rest in other outside airlift.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] that I hope that today's vote will not be seen as a repudiation of the committee's work in developing the notion of a nondevelopmental aircraft because in my judgment, looking at this budget

over the next 5 or 6 years, we are going to have a very hard time coming up with enough money for airlift.

So, I commend the chairman for putting forward this notion, and it was also encompassed in the bill by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN]. But I think we have got to continue to look at that option, and I certainly hope that the administration will look at it as well because, when we look at the money for airlift, it simply is not there unless we have a supplement to the C-17.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I yield further to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to close by saying that good government is about making wise choices. We must remember that it is the taxpayer who pays the cost of unwise choices. That, I believe, is why the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste endorse my amendment.

I think the C-17 is a flawed program. I think there are less risky military and commercial alternatives available to us. However, Mr. Chairman, I bow to the will of the House, and I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is said that those who do not study history are doomed to repeat it. On May 12, 1987, I stood in this very spot to offer virtually the same amendment as my colleague from Oregon. My amendment failed to pass. Very rarely in life are we granted the opportunity for a second chance, an opportunity to fix our mistakes. But, now, this body has the chance to correct itself. The C-17 was a waste of taxpayer funds then, in 1987, and it remains a waste of taxpayer funds now, in 1994.

In 1987, the C-17 was already behind schedule, already over cost, and far from being anything other than a paper airplane. How, in 1994, and C-17 is behind schedule by years, over cost by billions, the Air Force is cutting deals with the contractor to keep him solvent, and although the paper airplane is finally flying, the tail has almost fallen off; it has stalled in midflight and, because the pilot was unaware of the situation, the plane nearly crashed; it attempted to take off with only three engines, a maneuver most any plane can perform, failed to have sufficient power for the takeoff, and its fuselage scraped the ground; jump testing has recently been halted due to parachutists crashing into the vertical stabilizer; and, in the most recent incident, the brakes burned up on an emergency landing. The paper airplane of 1987 is now a metal airplane that really should still be a paper airplane.

There is no question that the Nation needs more airlift. As we draw down our forward deployed forces we must have the capability to rapidly move equipment and personnel to the battle site. The Air Force has singled out the C-17 as being uniquely capable of accessing more runways than the current C-5 and thus more capable of delivering this timely, critical

cargo. But the Rand Corp. says this is overstated because the C-17 requires a much stronger runway than the C-5. The Armed Services Committee performed a study that verifies this Rand finding. The Committee study documented that the C-17 and C-5 could land at about the same number of runways. In fact, the recent failure to take off with only three engines leads many experts to believe that the C-17 will not be able to meet the requirement of operating off of a 3,000-foot runway. And, the same argument that I used in 1987 remains true today: the Air Force will not take this \$400 million aircraft into the front lines.

The most rapid response to a crisis is through airlift. We must improve our airlift capabilities, but the C-17 is not the best solution.

The original proposal was to buy 210 C-17's. The previous administration realized this was unaffordable at the enormous unit cost of almost \$400 million each, and lowered the proposal to 120 aircraft. Now, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Transportation Command has testified before my Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations that he only really needs 60 or 65 and that other aircraft, C-5's or commercial wide-bodies, could perform the mission. And even this number, 60 to 65 aircraft, is only to establish a new core airlifter, not because the C-17 is currently the best alternative available. Even the Secretary of Defense's most recent selected acquisition report, the SAR, gives the number of C-17's to be procured as 40, rather than 120. Citing this SAR, the Air Force has been unable to provide the Armed Services Committee with updated cost data for the C-17 past fiscal year 1996.

There have also been tremendous alterations in the military specifications for the C-17. Basically, its payload capability has been severely decreased and its takeoff and landing distance has been greatly increased. When the plane couldn't meet the military requirements, the Air Force simply reduced the requirements.

Since May 13, 1987, I have kept a record of all the problems associated with the C-17. Let me cite a few highlights:

A March 1989 headline reports the "Air Force Is Stretching [C-17] Production to Cut Budget."

A June 1989 headline reports "Software Problems Lead to Massive C-17 Cost Overruns."

Another June 1989 headline reports "Luke-warm Support for C-17 Could Spell Doom for Costly Transport."

A July 1989 headline reports the Air Force "May Give the C-17 a New Job Description."

An October 1989 headline reports the C-17 "Will Have to Lose Weight to Meet Performance Specifications."

1990

A February 1990 headline reports that "Half of McDonnell's C-17 Tools Defective."

February 1990 headline reports "Pentagon Admits C-17 Is \$4 Billion Over Its Budget."

1991

A January 1991 headline reports "Massive Cost Overruns in C-17 Program Raise Specter of Termination."

An April 1991 headline reports that "Air Force Eases C-17 Payload Requirements."

Another April headline in Air Force Times states "C-17 Standards Cut to Lower Price, MAC Chief Says."

A July 1991 headline reports that the "Air Force Is Reluctant to Land C-17 Near Front."

1992

April headline says "Persistent Fuel Leaks in C-17 Test Aircraft Pose Troublesome Hurdle for Air Force."

1993

A March 1993 headline reports "C-17 Cost Rises as Deliveries Slip."

An April 1993 headline reports "C-17 Cargo Jet Nearly Fell During Test."

Another April headline reads "Pentagon to Consider Terminating C-17 as Part of Upcoming DAB Review."

Another April headline reports "Management Miscues, Delays Snarl C-17 Program."

A July 1993 headline says "Most C-17 Test Aircraft Have Substantial Fuel Leaks." This is the same headline as in April of 1992.

An August 1993 headline states "Pentagon, Industry Abuzz About Possible New C-17 Wing Test Problem."

AND NOW IN 1994

Just two and a half months ago a headline reads "C-17 Belly-flops on Runway in Botched Operational Test."

And just last month headlines said "C-17 Needs New Software Laws for Heavy Braking Situations."

The point is, Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on citing examples of problems with this program: Cost overrun problems, scheduling problems, design problems, technical problems, and management problems.

In 1987, during debate, my colleague from Georgia, Ed Jenkins, said that the C-17 was "nothing more than a Town Car for the Air Force!" Well, Mr. Speaker, now the C-17 can no longer even live up to that label. It can best be described as a broken-down Edsel.

Numerous committees in this House have held countless hearings on this program. I would suggest that there probably have been more hearings held on this program in the last 5 years than any other single Department of Defense program. These hearings were held not to determine the need for more airlift capability, but to see if there was any way to salvage this troubled program. I would also speculate that the majority of Members who have sat through these hearings, deep in their hearts, realize there is no way to effectively salvage this program and we should move on before we waste any more of the taxpayers' money.

The proposed Furse amendment would expand what the Armed Services Committee has done by directing the savings from the C-17 into the nondevelopmental aircraft account. This is how we should be addressing our airlift shortfall. Recent Air Force tests have proven to the Air Force that commercial wide-bodies can be loaded and offloaded much more efficiently than they originally projected. Also, it has been reported that at least 11 contractor teams have responded to the Air Force's request for nondevelopment airlift aircraft. Better alternatives are out there and we should not spend another dollar on the C-17.

The time has come for this House to make the proper decision, a decision that should have been made many years ago. Forget this \$40 billion boondoggle. Take these precious funds and direct them toward the procurement of a nondevelopment airlifter. The cancellation of this program and the subsequent directing

of these funds to escalate a nondevelopmental airlift program, be it C-5's or commercial wide-bodies, is the most cost-effective, time-efficient, and logical method for increasing and improving our airlift capabilities.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE], and I appreciate the integrity of her remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAROCO, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO NEXT CONSIDER PROCEEDINGS CONTEMPLATED BY SECTIONS 3(c) AND 3(d) OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 431

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House next resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of H.R. 4301, the Committee proceed to the consideration of the proceedings contemplated by sections 3(c) and 3(d) of House Resolution 431.

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

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so to clarify the situation we are in.

If I understand the gentleman's request correctly, this will move the debate next to a discussion on Haiti and then on to the discussion of peacekeeping, skipping over, for the moment, Bosnia.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct in both instances.

Mr. WALKER. In addition, it is my understanding then that we are going to come back to the Bosnia issue when we return from the district work period, and at that point we would have a more extended debate than was originally anticipated on Bosnia.

Is that correct?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], should speak on whether that issue is resolved or not.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for having yielded to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that we are intending to take up the Bosnian question on June 9, and there would be an hour of debate on the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and an hour of debate on the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY].

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I say, "So, our anticipation is that, once we have completed the work on peacekeeping and on Haiti, the Committee would then rise, not having completed the bill, and would come back to this bill."

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Upon completion of these two remaining items it would be the intention of this gentleman to move that the Committee do now rise. We would return to H.R. 4301 when we return from the Memorial Day break.

Mr. WALKER. Would a further unanimous-consent request be required in order to extend the debate?

Mr. DELLUMS. Yes, the gentleman is correct, and I will do that when the gentleman concludes his reservation of objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1720

PERMISSION TO EXPAND TIME FOR DEBATE ON AMENDMENTS PRINTED IN PART 3 OF HOUSE REPORT 103-520 ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 431

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4301, in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, pursuant to House Resolution 431, the time for debate on each of the amendments printed in part 3 of House Report 103-520 be expanded to 60 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponents and opponents of the amendments.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so just to clarify one more point, as we proceed

through tonight, it is the intention, as was mentioned previously, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] gave us his word on this, on the two items left, that we will complete those items tonight. We will go clear through to votes on both of those items tonight?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, for about the third time, the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to clarify that for Members over here. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has been very helpful throughout this.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the House Resolution 431 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4301.

□ 1721

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAROCCO Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 1 printed in part 6 of House Report 103-520, offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN], had been disposed of, and amendment No. 2, printed in part 6 of that report, was not offered.

It is now in order to debate the subject of Haiti. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise because I think this is an unprecedented amendment. We are considering an authorization of the Defense Department, and we suddenly plunged into foreign policy.

We consider the issue of Haiti so important that we have forced it on the agenda, and I would like to note that this is a matter that was not discussed and not taken through the usual committee procedure, neither the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Neither committee has considered this amendment. It went directly to the Committee on Rules, which means a number of people consider the issue of Haiti to be of great importance and great immediacy.

No one thinks the problem is more important than I do. As the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus task force on Haiti, we have been wrestling with the issue now for almost 2 years. We see no reason necessary to rush to judgment on any aspect of Haitian policy at this moment. However, we would like to call to the attention of those who see it as being such an immediate problem that it is an immediate problem which requires a more reasoned and a more deliberative solution, without interference of this kind.

It is important to note that it is a complex issue that has been discussed quite a bit lately, and the President finally has spelled out the fact that we do have compelling national interest in Haiti. We do have compelling national interests, because Haiti is located less than an hour away from the shores of the United States. We do have compelling interests, because there are a million Haitian-American citizens. We do have compelling interests because of the fact that large numbers of Haitians have left the country since the deposing of its rightfully elected president, John-Bertrand Aristide, elected by 70 percent of the vote, but overthrown by military coup. Since that time large numbers have left to come to the shores of the United States, and there is definitely a problem with relocating and resettling refugees.

We have not acted in a very moral manner. We have imposed conditions upon the Haitian refugees unlike any conditions ever imposed on refugees before. When the Hungarian revolution took place, not only did we accept refugees from Hungary without extensive interviews, but we also sent planes to pick them up. The planes were for free. They picked them up, they brought them back into this country, and large numbers of Hungarians were resettled because of the fact it was understood they were escaping a totalitarian regime.

Nobody interviewed each Hungarian to ask them are you a politician or in some way connected with the government, and sent them through a set of refined criteria to determine whether or not they deserve to come into this country as political refugees.

We do not recognize the Government of Haiti, and none of the other nations of the world recognize the Government

of Haiti at present. The military thugs who are in charge are criminals. They have no plan, they have no philosophy. They are not even good fascists. They are just criminals, using their power to drain off all the remaining resources of a very poor country. We are dealing with criminals, and we cannot negotiate with criminals.

The issue is raised over and over again about the use of every other means to effect change in Haiti and restore the rightfully elected President. We would like to see every other means used, but we do not want to rule out the option of force.

We do not want them to know there is no option to use force to restore the democratically elected President. We do want to use every means, and we must concede that this administration has not used every available means.

We have had rhetoric which talked about using sanctions. We have had rhetoric which talked about an embargo, rhetoric which talked about lifting the passports of the military leaders and the elite who helped to overthrow the rightfully elected government. But those sanctions have not been enforced, the passports have not been lifted, and the assets of the officers have not been frozen.

There are a number of steps we were promised that would be taken that were never taken. Even now there is a shallow commitment to the lifting of passports, the freezing of assets, and going beyond the U.N. resolution which imposes an embargo on all goods except food and medicine. That embargo itself is a joke if we continue to allow the border between the Dominican Republic and Haiti to be a sieve through which everything flows.

We can put pressure on the Dominican Republic. They are a close friend of ours and receive aid from us. But we are not seriously enforcing the embargo, because we let the traffic continue to flow across the border. We have not taken all the steps we can take peacefully. We should take those steps. We should do nothing here in the Congress to rule out any policy option of the administration in the meantime.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by commending the efforts of my colleagues, PORTER GOSS and JON KYL, in bringing this matter to the floor of the House. It is due to their diligence that the House has this timely opportunity to debate and consider the various directions of the administration's Haiti policy.

A few short weeks ago, the President signed "PDD-25" which attempts to map out administration policy on peacekeeping. A central element of this document is a checklist of conditions used to evaluate whether the United States should undertake any given peacekeeping operation.

However, when you apply the Clinton Peacekeeping Doctrine to Haiti, the

first test since the PDD was signed, it flunks the test.

The first criteria for U.S. involvement is: "Is there a threat to international peace and security?" The answer in Haiti is obviously no. If such a threat to international security existed the only country sharing land with Haiti—the Dominican Republic—would be clamoring for action.

The second criteria for U.S. involvement is: "Does the mission have a clear objective?" The answer is once again no. The only mission objective seems to be to restore Aristide to power, even if that may not be the most realistic or viable approach to achieving a lasting democracy in Haiti. The long-term mission of U.S. military is very unclear.

The third criteria for U.S. involvement is: "Do all parties agree to a U.N. presence?" The answer for Haiti is no. Supporters of the military regime proved that last October 11 in greeting the U.S.S. *Harlan County* with violent protests.

The fourth criteria for U.S. involvement is: "Are sufficient resources available for the mission?" The answer here is a qualified no. The DOD budget is already reeling from budget cuts under President Clinton and burdened with the costs of numerous other peacekeeping operations, and it is unlikely that Congress would appropriate new funds to bankroll a military expedition in Haiti.

The fifth criteria for U.S. involvement is: "Can an end-point to the operation be identified?" The answer once again is a resounding no unless the United States enters with only the limited objective of restoring Aristide and withdraws immediately afterwards. Such a strategy would likely result in a replay of the military coup that chased Aristide from Haiti in the first place and is therefore not a viable option in the long term.

Mr. Chairman, as you can see, U.S. military action to restore President Aristide to power resoundingly fails the administration's own peacekeeping conditions. If for no other reason, the House ought to strongly reject the military option under consideration.

The Haiti amendments that the House will consider are similar in substance but different in tone. Both embrace Mr. KYL's original language expressing congressional opposition to military intervention in Haiti. As such, the House has before it little choice on that question.

Therefore, I am hopeful that the outcome of today's debate will send a clear message to the White House that elements of its current policy considerations on Haiti are not supported by the Congress.

Vote "yes" on the Goss-Kyl amendment to send the clearest message possible.

□ 1730

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

Mr. Chairman, I remember taking the well in a different context dealing with issues that were compelling, human rights questions that were extraordinarily important. At that time it was in the context of South Africa.

Mr. Chairman, at that time I rose and I said to my colleagues that what is happening in South Africa is deplorable. And it seems to me that there are three options that we can address.

Mr. Chairman, we said then, in the context of South Africa, that there were three options available to us. I would suggest in the context of Haiti, there are three options available to us.

We can step aside and do nothing. That is unacceptable. We can talk about the use of force and the invasion of Haiti. Mr. Chairman, I came here 24 years ago as an advocate of peace. I have stood in the well over and over and over again saying that peace is a better idea and diplomacy and political solutions to problems are a better idea. So I take the use of force off the table.

Which comes then to the third option, how do we, within the context of the powers that we have available to us, stand up in defense of human rights and democratic principles in the context of Haiti?

Mr. Chairman, this issue has been on the back burner for too long. The gentleman from New York is absolutely correct. This is not the fashion in which this amendment ought to come. The Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to bring a bill to the floor of Congress to address this. We introduced such a bill and had over 100 cosponsors. There should be hearings. There should be a process by which these matters are dealt with.

But we all understand the politics that go on in these Chambers and, because there is no vehicle, the House Committee on Armed Services bill becomes a vehicle for foreign policy matters.

All right. Then here we are. I am prepared to stand up and face the moment. We cannot keep crying about should have or would have or could have been. We have to deal with what is at this moment. We now have to deal with what is at this moment. We now have an opportunity to talk.

Mr. Chairman, the death and destruction that is taking place in Haiti is an abomination, and we need to stand up unequivocally and oppose it. The drugs that are being trafficked through this situation that have impacted upon our Nation are something that we need to address.

Mr. Chairman, the refugees that are coming toward this country is an example of the deplorable set of circumstances that exist in Haiti that must be addressed. The issue in Haiti, the message we ought to be sending

around the world and certainly in this region is, what is more powerful, the bullet or the ballot?

In the context of Haiti, the Haitian people said, the ballot is more powerful than the bullet. And if we truly believe that, then we must stand in unequivocal opposition to what is happening in Haiti.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the international efforts that have been taken by this administration, but I believe that this administration also, on a unilateral basis, has an opportunity to impose sanctions and bring stringent pressure on the people in Haiti that are denying these human beings their human rights, their human dignity, their human freedom, and their democratic principles.

Mr. Chairman, remember Nelson Mandela just raised his hand as the President of a great nation in some part because of what this Nation did unilaterally, as we stood up in the world community and took a position and said that we must stand in defense of democratic principles.

Can we do less with respect to Haiti? Can we do less in this region? We should be buoyed by the experiences of South Africa. We should be inspired by the installment of Nelson Mandela in South Africa to give us a feeling that we do have a role to play, make a significant contribution in elevating the international conscience with respect to this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I would not have liked to see this amendment come to the floor in this fashion. I always believe there ought to be hearings and discussions and debate and deliberation. But the fact of the matter is that there is great frustration in these Chambers and so we end up in this place. The one gentleman has offered an amendment. We offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. But at least it takes the issue off the back burner, puts it on the front burner of America and allows us to discuss this issue in some clear and unequivocal terms.

The message that we must send to the elite and the powerful in the military in Haiti is that as a great Nation we cannot sit by idly and allow these things to happen.

The world is marching toward a more rational reality. The world is marching toward some greater reality, some greater commitment to human rights.

When Israelis and Palestinians can cross oceans of time to shake hands, to march forward into the future, when Nelson Mandela and Afrikaners can shake hands to march into the future, then it is very clear that the world is on a different path, Mr. Chairman.

We have to be on the right side of history. I am concerned that we are not bringing the most stringent pressure that we can on Haiti.

Question: Does sanction create greater dislocation and bring pain to people

in Haiti? The answer is yes. But it can be temporary. At this point, the pain and the oppression are permanent. The death and destruction is real on a daily basis.

My hope is that this separate strategy, nonviolent though it be, a rejection of force, though it be, I will stand proudly and clearly saying that I think that there is a nonviolent mechanism that we can use. We have always argued in these Chambers that before we talk about the use of force that we should be willing to exhaust all nonviolent means to bring pressure to achieve our commitment to democratic principles and to a commitment to human rights.

Well, we are not there yet, Mr. Chairman. We are not bringing the awesome, necessary pressure to bear that we in this country can bring. I hope that we do. This is beginning a significant debate that I hope ends up putting this country on the right side of history.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

□ 1740

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. DELLUMS, for an excellent statement. It is not often that he and I are in agreement on matters, or I should say only occasionally we are not in agreement. On this matter we are very much in agreement.

I think his statement was eloquent, first of all, in making the point that it is no option to do nothing; second, in making the point that it is no option to use force, and I might say that I introduced a resolution to the Committee on Rules rejecting the use of force in Haiti unless it could be determined that the security interests of the United States were involved, at which point, of course, we could do so. That has not been demonstrated. I do not think it can be, so we should not be resorting to force.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to say that both the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] incorporated the language of my resolution regarding the use of force into their two amendments, so irrespective of which of those two amendments might be adopted, we make a clear statement in both of them that we are not going to resort to force. In that, I certainly compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] in making the case more eloquently than could I.

Of course, he points out that the third option is to debate, study, and to determine a course of action that forcefully deals with the issue, the

issue politically, the issue economically, the issue from a standpoint of human rights, and on this we are also in agreement.

The only point I would disagree with my colleague on is that I do not believe that the use of sanctions at this point is a sound policy. That is a matter upon which reasonable people can differ. It is a matter upon which I believe, unfortunately, the people who are in power there today will not respond positively, and that sanctions only hurt the people who we are trying to help. I know, as I say, that it is a point upon which reasonable people can differ.

However, I would suggest that it is the diplomatic and the economic and the political pressure that the United States can bring to bear that must ultimately resolve this situation, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] just pointed out. We have to bring that kind of pressure to bear.

Just to note, yesterday in the Washington Times there was an article describing how the smugglers make a mockery of the toughened U.N. embargo on Haiti, shipping hundreds of gallons of gasoline and diesel oil from the Dominican Republic. So even if there is an embargo, it does not work.

We have the problem of the Haitian children, who are having to rely upon CARE distribution of soy meal and wheat for their daily ration. Most of them go to sleep crying from hunger. This is something that has to be resolved and has to be resolved quickly.

Mr. Chairman, if the greatest Nation on earth cannot bring the kind of pressure to bear upon the situation there that can relieve this hunger and can relieve this poverty, then we have not done our day's work.

We have a problem, of course, because we can only take in the political refugees, and they only represent a proportion of those people who are trying to immigrate from Haiti, so we have to address the problem of the economic refugees. It is not good enough to simply turn them back. We have to resolve the situation by finding a way to bring the pressure on the people who are currently in Haiti and running that Government there, to resolve the political differences, to change the political system, to restore a sense of economic prosperity to the country which will relieve both the political and the economic burden, and the poverty and the sense of frustration that the people cannot resolve the situation on their own, and have to emigrate to this country.

Only by relieving that pressure will we resolve the suffering of the people who set out on the high seas, to come to this country, only to either end up drowning on the high seas or find themselves having to be turned back. That is a situation that we cannot allow to continue.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I think it is wise that we have made a very strong statement here against the use of force in Haiti, and I compliment my colleagues for adopting my resolution that abjures the use of force, and compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for again raising our voice to find a way to restore both the political and the economic situation to Haiti that will resolve this situation once and for all.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, during the next 70 minutes, this House will have the chance to focus attention on an ongoing foreign and immigration policy crisis. Under the original boundaries of the DOD authorization bill, this debate would not have been allowed. But many Members—representing hundreds of thousands of Americans concerned about U.S. military intervention and an ongoing refugee crisis—forced the issue. United States policy toward Haiti is important and is directly relevant to our national interests.

While the President might prefer we remain silent, it is appropriate for this Congress to go on record now, before American lives are placed in harm's way. So I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee, and the chairman and ranking members of the Armed Services Committee for agreeing to allow this debate to proceed. Later, my colleagues will be asked to consider two competing views of where United States policy toward Haiti should be heading. Do we look back, toward failed policies of punishing economic sanctions, and stalled negotiated agreements? Or do we look ahead, toward a positive solution for Haiti, implemented by Haitians and carried out on Haitian soil? Mr. Chairman, Haiti lies in America's own backyard. Although desperately poor, the Haitian people know what they want: peace, democracy, and a better life. In overwhelming numbers they took a courageous step toward that future when, in December 1990, they elected Father Jean Bertrand Aristide to be their President. As an official elections observer, I watched as nearly 70 percent of Haitians voted enthusiastically for President Aristide, and celebrated his victory with new hope for a better future in Haiti. After the military coup in 1991, the United States and the international community have sought in vain to broker a solution to the ongoing stalemate. But the result of these efforts has been greater polarization and an emboldened military right wing. As President Clinton and outspoken United States activists continue to beat the drum for military intervention—somehow believing that democracy can be propped up at the barrel of a gun—the Haitian people, suffering under the terrible burden of

international sanctions, grow more demoralized. Since the President's latest policy swerve on Haiti, hundreds of Haitians have again taken to leaky boats in a desperate attempt to flee economic hardship, and in some cases, fear of political persecution. It doesn't matter to them that the details of the President's ill-defined new refugee processing policy are still unavailable. It doesn't matter that the shipboard processing has not yet begun and there is no third country option in play. It does not matter whether this is a foreign affairs or an armed services debate. The only thing that matters to these people without hope is getting out of Haiti—where they see no future. Mr. Chairman, there is a better way for Haiti that can bring about an end to the economic sanctions, an opportunity for return of the duly elected President, an orderly and expanded policy for processing refugees, a workable means for supplying humanitarian relief, and a stepping stone to long-term democracy in Haiti. Take a close look at the Goss safe haven plan—it is all there: Haitians, solving Haiti's problems on Haitian soil, under UN/OAS auspices. There in the Ile de la Gonave in the heart of Haiti's major bay.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss].

The increasing human rights abuses and repression in Haiti are tragic and deeply distressing. The situation highlights the need for international actions that clearly show support for the democratically-elected government. The Goss amendment puts the House on record in that regard.

The House should be on record as recognizing that there are other options than using U.S. military force; that we support development of the democratic center; and that any ultimate solution lies with the Haitians themselves.

Regardless of how one views President Aristide, he was elected in a process deemed "free and fair" by the international community, and by a broad spectrum of Haitians themselves.

We have a long-term hemispheric interest in supporting democratic processes, even when they produce people with whom we do not philosophically agree.

Since the coup that ousted President Aristide, I have favored a strong United States response in support of the return of constitutional rule to Haiti; and, until that is achieved, a recognition that we should not condone repression by denying people the right to flee from the tyranny of their oppressors.

Diplomatic and political pressure, and full implementation of the Gov-

ernors Island Accord, offers the best hope for resolving the crisis and is essential to restoring constitutional government to Haiti.

Recent actions by the Haitian military underscore that they are not interested in respecting the Haitian people, human rights, or their own commitments made to the international community at Governors Island.

I share the concern of many over the likely ineffectiveness and ultimately negative consequences of economic sanctions against Haiti. After some 15 years of encouraging U.S. business to invest in that country, the sanctions have destroyed an important United States presence and will deter many businessmen from looking to Haiti in the future as a place to invest.

However, we are limited in the diplomatic and political instruments available to us. Sanctions is one such instrument. As a moral statement that the coup regime lacks legitimacy, they are important.

My work over the years has been based on one fundamental principle: respect for the human rights and dignity of all individuals. The tragedy that has befallen Haiti only strengthens my opinion that respect for human rights is central to democratic rule and economic development.

Given the increasing violence by the military, and having set out on a course of comprehensive sanctions, it is unfair to say to the Haitian people that they suffer by remaining on the island.

As a result, I have repeatedly called on the executive branch to change our immigration policy, which discriminates against Haitians on the basis that they are economic refugees, not political refugees. Given the current realities of Haiti, this is a distinction without a difference.

The Goss amendment urges the establishment of a temporary safe haven for Haitian refugees. Such a safe haven would be a humane and constructive alternative to current administration policy, and the idea merits our endorsement and support.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Goss amendment.

□ 1750

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLETTA].

Mr. FOGLETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have reached the point which very seldom happens in the Congress of the United States where I do not fully agree with my colleague from California. Our positions have been together for a long, long time. Some years ago, he and I led a coalition against our involvement in the Persian Gulf War. Our position then

was that we should not use force because we had not exhausted our ability to negotiate, we had not negotiated as far as we could. We had said that sanctions were not given the chance to work. We should see sanctions to their fullest, we should negotiate and try to avoid bloodshed. We believed that our Government was not doing that.

Mr. Chairman, our coalition got 186 Members of this body to vote against the use of force in the Persian Gulf. Now we come to a situation in Haiti, we see a situation where one of our ships went there to offer humanitarian aid and 50 to 100 hoodlums standing on the dock turned away a ship of the United States of America and sent us back. We hear a suggestion here for safe havens, to take Aristide and those who would support him out of their homeland and put them on an island somewhere.

What would we do? Then give the criminals, Francois and Cedras, the island? "This is your island, do what you will with it, kill as you will with it."

Mr. Chairman, is that what we should do? Let us look at sanctions. The sanctions have not worked. We see what is happening. Quoting an Associated Press article just the other day, "Eight hours after New World sanctions had taken effect, boats loaded with fuel crossed Saumatre Lake from the Dominican Republic." Boats docked every 5 minutes with fuel that people were selling and making the criminals richer and richer.

Mr. Chairman, they are laughing at us in Haiti. Certainly the sanctions which have been imposed are not the fullest sanctions, we still could go further. We could also now at this point freeze assets. We could do other things right now. However, we have tried sanctions. Sanctions have not worked. Negotiations? We have negotiated until we are blue in the face. The Governors Island Accord, they laughed at us, thumbed their nose at us on the Governors Island Accord.

Mr. Chairman, when I was in Haiti, there was actually a suggestion made that Cedras be made Ambassador to Spain, that Francois be made Ambassador to Chile. How much more could we have negotiated? We negotiated as far as we could. Sanctions are not working.

My friend spoke the other day on the University of the Americas. The gentleman said, "Sometimes we must send a signal." I think now we must send a signal that we will support democracy and we will not support the kind of criminal anarchy we see on that island.

I believe, sir, we really have to sit down and say, "Have we reached the ultimate last resort?" I believe we have.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, there is no congressional district in this country that is more impacted by what is going on in Haiti than my home district along the southeast coast of the State of Florida. We know the pitiful situation that does exist in Haiti and we know the reason that we should go forward and do something to alleviate the problem.

Mr. Chairman, we have two suggestions here before us today. One I think they both have in common, they say, let us not repeat a mistake of history that was made many, many years ago when we found American troops going to Haiti and not being able to remove them for decades. I applaud that provision in both of the amendments that are before us. But the problem with the Dellums amendment is that the Dellums amendment would intensify a mistake that the present administration is presently making.

Mr. Chairman, in this particular amendment what the gentleman from California advocates is that we look for land base in order to question these people seeking asylum, and where it does speak of seeking a land base in other countries, it does in no way preclude that land base to be here in the United States. We know that once the refugees get into the United States, whether they have any claim to political asylum at all, all they have to say is a few words and they are here.

Mr. Chairman, we are already overrun in this country. One-sixth of the population of Haiti lives in the United States. There are more Haitians right now living in New York than there are in Port-au-Prince. This is how we have gotten the situation totally out of control.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Clinton administration is making a horrible mistake in intensifying the sanctions, making it rougher for the people who live in Haiti, giving them more incentives to leave and then telling them, "All you have to do is get off shore, we are going to put you on an ocean liner where you can live until such time as we determine whether you can come to the United States." In the meantime, many are going to slip through the net, come as refugees to the United States and stay here.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we look for a positive force on what are we going to do to change this. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has come up with a recommendation that sets up a safe haven right on Haitian soil. It is so practical and so simplistic that it is workable and there is no question about it.

It is a first step. I would hope that we would then train Haitians who live here in the United States as soldiers to go back and reclaim their island, not to impose on them the forces of the

United States but train the Haitian forces to go back. That particular provision was not made in order under the rules and that, I think, is unfortunate.

However, the only constructive amendment out there that is going to change the status quo is the Goss amendment. To do otherwise is to simply leave the pressure on the Haitian people to escape to the United States and then set up a procedure where more of them will get into the United States. That is a mistake, that does not solve the problem of Haiti, that does not solve the problem of the people of South Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a rejection of the Dellums amendment and I would urge acceptance of the Goss amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAROCCO). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 2 minutes remaining to close the debate.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's leadership from the great State of California who has been an outspoken advocate of the return of democracy to Haiti. I know that everyone in this Chamber believes that we ought to return democracy to Haiti.

Mr. Chairman, many people that talk about the Haitian issue want to try in some ways to distinguish whether or not Haiti deserves United States military attention, whether it deserves the attention of our country in general. I would suggest that unlike Bosnia, unlike Somalia, unlike Rwanda and other hot spots around the world, Haiti is in a unique position because it crosses a line in the United States own self-interest.

Mr. Chairman, the key question in my mind is not so much a particular friendship with President Aristide, although he is a close friend, not whether or not the United States is morally committed to returning democracy to Haiti, which I think we are as a Nation, but the real question is whether or not this is in the United States own enlightened self-interest.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is no question that Haiti meets that test. The reason it meets that test is because no other Nation has the potential of putting 5 or 6 million people on boats that are going to come and invade our shores. If we are serious about holding off that kind of flotilla, if we are willing to deal with the economic devastation that that could create, it seems to me that we have a moral obligation to, in fact, restore democracy into Haiti.

□ 1800

That is the only way we will build up the economy. It is the only way we will build up the confidence of the people of

Haiti to stay in Haiti and to build up their own nation. That is why I believe that it is important for us to avoid the circumstances of putting people on islands as the Goss amendment will call for. It is the reason why I believe we ought to allow President Clinton's new policy that has just gone into effect this last Saturday night of tough and swift sanctions, that we know are going to be devastating and difficult on the people of Haiti, but will, in fact, bring about, in my opinion, the return of President Aristide.

Let us give the sanctions a try. Let us give this policy a real chance. Let us ask the administration to be tougher in terms of how it stands up to the Dominican Republic, but let us give this policy a chance before we give up and before we disallow the return of President Aristide.

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

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, let me simply say to my colleagues that I understand that there are a number of my distinguished colleagues on this side of the aisle who, in a great sense of frustration, are not prepared to reject the issue of the use of force. I would simply say to all of them and remind them that it has always been their position that the use of force should be the last alternative and that we needed to escalate as far as we could until we have exhausted all other avenues.

I would submit to you that I am prepared to challenge anyone walking in the well of the House that could say to us at this point that that is where we are. We know we are not there. We know that those sanctions are not on. We know that visas have not been lifted. We know commercial aircraft have not been stopped. We know that assets have not been laid on.

Mr. Chairman, we know that full sanctions are not there. They just came on a couple of days ago. We know that the borders are not leakproof. We know that we have not come to the point where the issue of force is one of last resort.

I am simply saying that if you could come with us on the piece of legislation that we introduced into the House of Representatives, cosponsored by over a hundred Members, that that is where we are at this point, and we are not being inconsistent.

I thank you for your generosity.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 431, it is now in order to consider the amendments printed in part 4 of House Report 103-520 relating to Haiti which shall be considered in the following order: First, by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and, second, a substitute by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part 4 of House Report 103-520.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss:

At the end of title X (page 277, after line 2), add the following:

SEC. 1038. UNITED STATES POLICY ON HAITI.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the 1990 presidential election in Haiti was deemed to be both free and democratic;

(2) a military coup toppled the duly elected government in 1991;

(3) the process to restore democratic rule in Haiti agreed to at Governor's Island has stalled;

(4) the economic crisis in Haiti is worsening; and

(5) the people of Haiti are preparing in mass numbers to leave their country to seek economic and political refuge overseas.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress—

(1) that the United States should not undertake any military action directed against the mainland of Haiti unless the President first certifies to Congress that clear and present danger to citizens of the United States or United States interests requires such action; and

(2) that the United States should work with the Organization of American States and the United Nations—

(A) to establish a temporary safe haven on the Haitian island of Ile de la Gonave for Haitian refugees escaping economic and political hardship on the mainland of Haiti;

(B) to assist in providing humanitarian assistance and visa processing for such refugees in such safe haven; and

(C) to assist the legitimate Haitian government in establishing the long-term stability of democracy in Haiti.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] will be recognized for 10 minutes on his amendment, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I had heard before we began this that there was a possibility we would combine the times of the two amendments into two 20-minute blocks. Does that no longer have the favor of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The only thing that precludes that from occurring is the offering of the substitute amendment by the gentleman from California or the gentleman from Indiana. Once it has

been offered, the time can be commingled and divided.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to do that for the convenience and the continuity of the debate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a Substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: At the end of title X add the following:

SEC. 1038. UNITED STATES POLICY ON HAITI.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the 1990 presidential election in Haiti was deemed by numerous international observers to be both free and democratic;

(2) a military coup toppled the duly elected government of President Jean Bertrand Aristide in 1991;

(3) the process to restore democratic rule in Haiti agreed to at Governor's Island has stalled; and

(4) a deepening economic crisis in Haiti and political oppression and systematic human rights abuses by Haiti's military leaders have created a reprehensible humanitarian crisis and driven Haitians to risk the perils of the sea to seek refuge in increasing numbers.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress—

(1) that the United States should not undertake any military action directed against the mainland of Haiti unless there is a clear and present danger to citizens of the United States or United States interests requires such action;

(2) that the President should swiftly intensify economic pressure on Haiti's military should United Nations Security Council Resolution 917 fail to result in Haiti's military leaders to step down by May 21, 1994. The first step in any such increased pressure should be the severing of commercial air links with Haiti. The President should seek international compliance with any such heightened pressure, if possible, but should act unilaterally, if necessary, and should seek improved sanctions enforcement by the international community to compel Haiti's military rulers to relinquish power;

(3) that the United States should make every effort to replace shipboard processing of Haitian migrants with land-based processing at the earliest opportunity; and in view of past difficulties in the processing of Haitian applicants for refugee status under the laws of the United States, Creole translators and counsel should be integral parts of any revamped refugee policy;

(4) that the United States should seek the cooperation of third countries for the establishment of refugee processing centers;

(5) that the United States should augment humanitarian assistance for Haiti's poor and seek the expeditious return to Haiti of human rights monitors acting under the auspices of the United Nations and the Organization of American States; and

(6) that the United States should continue to engage in intensive, immediate consultation within the international community to encourage support for the restoration of democracy and national reconciliation in Haiti, including encouraging all parties to

honor their obligations under the Governor's Island Accord of July 3, 1993 and the New York Pact of July 16, 1993 with the principal aim of restoration of democracy and the return to Haiti of President Aristide.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. GOSS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] in support of his amendment, will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the President is holding open his options in Haiti with a stepped up embargo and contingency plans for military intervention. Failing the first, the second option will do. In fact, Randall Robinson, the President's de facto special adviser on Haiti, gave voice to this idea yesterday saying that "Because sanctions will not work we have no choice but to pursue ultimately a solution of military intervention."

I agree about the sanctions, but I disagree about the military intervention. Today, Members who feel strongly about keeping United States soldiers out of a quagmire in Haiti and about the unwise extension of the embargo can go on record in opposition to the President's policy and I support of the constructive alternative embodied in the Goss safe-haven amendment. This resolution supports the establishment of a safe haven under U.N./OAS auspices on the 269-square-mile Haitian island of Gonave to accomplish a number of things.

That island, incidentally, is right here in the Bay of Haiti, 270 square miles. It is a rather large island with about 80,000 people on it right now.

By following the safe-haven plan, we provide the real opportunity for the duly elected President to return. We provide to reestablish his administration if he does return. We provide the opportunity to give nearby refuge to Haitians who truly are in danger and stop the flood of refugees going from this area, 900 miles through shark-infested waters, to the U.S. mainland. It helps to facilitate the provision of much needed humanitarian aid, and there is not a person in this room who does not know that, allowing for orderly visa processing in a safer environment than the Haitian mainland or the high seas.

With one standby Coast Guard cutter already in the area, as we all know, we would be able to enhance the natural defense of the island without military commitment. With only 15 miles to travel, Haitian refugees do not have to make that long trip to Florida, and they do not have to risk taking to the seas to rendezvous with American vessels which are who knows where. We do not know which vessels even.

Everything we need to do is encompassed in this deceptively simple plan.

It offers an open door to solve the refugee problem, to solve the Aristide problem, to keep American soldiers out of harm's way. This is not a new idea. We did it in Sri Lanka, and it is called the open refugee center. It works. We did it on Mannar Island successfully.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will offer a substitute amendment which offers strong language against military intervention, thank heavens. The Dellums-Hamilton amendment has no safe-haven plan, though. It does have a strong endorsement of the punitive sanctions that have turned the economy to rubble in Haiti, that have turned the environment to a catastrophe and to a wasteland, and that have victimized almost everybody except the military it is aimed to hit.

It has no plan to move Haiti beyond the current impasse. Let us look at the key differences. The Goss amendment demagnetizes United States shores by creating a safe haven on Haitian soil, offering a long-term solution for stability in Haiti, and an end to the embargo.

Dellums-Hamilton endorses the ill-advised policy of tougher sanctions and expanded but nonexistent refugee processing which has already led almost 1,300 Haitians to take to the seas only to be returned immediately. A cruel hoax, to be sure.

President Aristide: Let us talk about him. The Goss amendment provides for the opportunity for return of the democratically elected President to begin rebuilding stability in Haiti. Dellums-Hamilton depends on the failed Governor's Island accord. It tries to breathe life into the corpse.

Fostering democracy, the Goss amendment helps Haiti back on the democratic track. It paves the way to ending the punishing embargo and providing a much needed morale boost to the poor people of Haiti.

The Dellums-Hamilton amendment amounts to an externally imposed solution to the crisis that will do little to bolster confidence among Haitians but a lot to polarize the extremes as we have already seen in the Emile Jonassaint alleged government.

The Goss amendment obviates the need to charter cruise ships for high-seas refugee processing.

Dellums-Hamilton endorses the President's protracted refugee processing plan.

Mr. Chairman, if you want meaningful progress in Haiti, the administration's approach is not the answer. Do not be fooled into endorsing a voodoo policy by voting for the Dellums-Hamilton substitute.

Vote for the original Goss amendment and send the White House a sense of Congress to help the Haitians get on with the business of taking back their country today. It is the humane and

practical thing to do and this is the island, and it is, indeed, in Haiti, and there are 80,000 Haitians on it now.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me this time.

I want to speak in support of the Dellums-Hamilton amendment. What we are trying to do with this amendment is to move the Haitian policy in a more constructive direction, and the amendment is designed to help create a better policy for Haiti.

□ 1810

It is very important I think that the leaders in Haiti, the regime leaders now understand that we are committed to their removal and we support the democratic will of the Haitian people. It is clearly time for them to go.

Now what we do here is set out in the amendment drafted by Mr. DELLUMS and myself a policy toward Haiti. The first statement is that other options have to be exhausted before you turn to military force. Force is a last resort. This amendment urges the administration to seek alternatives to the use of force and urges it to ratchet up the pressure through other means and seek national reconciliation in Haiti.

The second point of the amendment is with respect to the refugees. What we are trying to do here is simply establish a fair procedure for dealing with the refugees. We move to a land-based refugee processing system. We think that is essential in order for the system to be fair.

We want to provide translators and legal representation made available to those who need the service. We welcome the use of private organizations and their services and the involvement of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, certainly a sound and good step forward.

It is also important that the administration encourage Haiti's neighbors to establish refugee processing centers. So the second point of the amendment is trying to make the process for the refugees a fair one.

The next point is with respect to sanctions: The amendment addresses that. Greater economic pressure should be imposed on the Haitian regime. The whole point here is to tighten the sanctions and to target the sanctions. Sanctions should be imposed on regime leaders and prominent supporters across-the-board without exception.

Bank accounts should be frozen, travel should be denied. The administration should sever commercial air links which are used by the Haitian elite and the military to circumvent sanctions.

We certainly need to seek to improve the enforcement along the border with the Dominican Republic and to increase humanitarian relief efforts.

The final point of the amendment is national reconciliation. It addresses a political solution. To increase the chances for the success of the policy, the United States urges President Aristide to reach out to other democratic elements in Haiti in the spirit of national reconciliation as outlined in the amendment. So you have here then a strategy of strong United States-led international pressure on the Haitian regime combined with a political strategy to pave the way for Aristide's return. We believe that that offers the best chance for success.

Now the gentleman from Florida has an amendment that is offered in a very constructive manner, and I know he has done a lot of thinking with respect to this problem, also constructively. But his proposal for a temporary safe haven on the Haitian island simply, I think, will not work. It establishes an international presence on the island that constitutes invasion of Haitian sovereignty. That island lacks basic infrastructure including a source of drinkable water. Supplying that island is complicated because it does not have a deep water port, nor an airstrip. Upgrading the facilities to set up this legitimate regime in a nonpermissive territory would cost a great deal of money.

The United States would have to pay for it.

Setting up a refugee camp on sovereign Haitian territory is problematic in the application of international refugee standards. It is very doubtful that President Aristide would agree to the plan outlined in the amendment. He may simply view this as a ruse to restore him to power in purely technical terms without removing the military junta or restoring democracy.

So I would urge my colleagues here to defeat the Goss amendment and to support the Dellums/Hamilton amendment because that amendment moves us toward a better policy in Haiti.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Goss amendment. The Goss amendment gives us a chance to address the most important and dangerous result of the President's failed Haitian policy: The increasing numbers of refugees entering the United States through Florida.

Since President Clinton invited Haitians to take to the seas 2 weeks ago, the Coast Guard has intercepted and returned 1,400 of them without asylum hearings. As the United Nations sanctions make life worse in Haiti, thou-

sands and thousands of Haitians per week are expected to flee their suffering nation. President Clinton offers his Ukrainian "Loveboat" scenario in response. But this will not prevent thousands of refugees from Haiti or the Bahamas from coming to the United States in search of education, medical care and other social services, services which cost the State of Florida an annual average of \$3,000 for each refugee.

With the Goss proposal in place using the island as a safe haven, fewer Haitians would drown at sea, fewer political refugees would be returned to Haiti and fewer economic refugees would end up in the United States. It would eliminate the use of military force which I oppose. It would feed the poorest of the poor. It is the right idea at the right time, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me. I hear two points of view here today, and I would like to say that with all respect to my Florida colleagues, I hear more a referendum on not having Haitians come to Florida than I do on solving the foreign policy issue of Haitians and freeing them and making a democracy in Haiti.

I think that we should certainly vote against the Goss amendment because it is an amendment that sets up a safe haven, quote unquote. It is not a safe haven to set up the kind of arrangement which Mr. GOSS has mentioned here.

I think the main purpose behind it is to keep the Haitians from trying to return to Florida and to receive some kind of safe haven there or in the United States.

I think I rise in opposition to my good friend who is a friend of peace, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], who feels very strongly within himself, within every sinew of his being, that there should be freedom and peace throughout this world. But this country, the Clinton administration has tried everything possible.

Sanctions are dangerous also; they kill people also. If you read the paper, you will see children lining up for food; that is in a killing field, almost as dangerous as a gun or as dangerous as a bullet.

I also feel that we should show that we are the freedom leaders of the world as we have with other countries and the military intervention, whatever the cost is—this morning I listened to Randall Robinson on television, a man who gave his life—put his life on the line for freedom to Haiti. He is now saying that he thinks the military intervention is the only course. I think the reason he is saying it is because everything else has been tried.

So I stand today to say to all of you, that I know that the sanctions are there, but they are not helping; people are still being killed, and that Haiti is in danger. Four people were killed recently. The children—the parents are in Miami, the children are in Haiti, and I cannot listen to this particular debate without saying to you to think of what is happening in Haiti today. Forget about having some more immigrants coming to our shores. This is really in the wrong venue today. This is not a foreign policy bill. This is an armed services bill. But we are talking about Haiti here. So I must come to my feet and say that we must vote against the Goss amendment. The Dellums amendment is better designed for better reasons, but I cannot even support that, because I feel we should leave some option open for us to let the thugs in Haiti understand that they cannot continue to kill and to maim people and hurt little children as they continue to do.

I want my chairman [Mr. DELLUMS] to know that I respect him and I also respect the Florida delegation.

They have two different motives. But I think the Goss amendment should definitely be defeated. I certainly want to give deference in saying that I cannot vote for either one of these.

□ 1820

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, like all of us, I am very sympathetic to the plight of the Haitians. I do not think anybody in this Chamber can look at what is going on down there and not be concerned over the past several years with increasing military domination of that island and the failure to allow democracy to be restored, as it should have been when President Aristide was elected. However, Mr. Chairman, the solutions that are there on the table today that President Clinton is offering contain no vision, no real innovative way of getting around the problem or solving it, and therein lies the rub.

Mr. Chairman, sanctions are not working. They are not likely to work. A military invasion of Haiti, while relatively simple to accomplish, leaves us holding the bag for however many years, who knows, once we have established the ground base there, as we did many years ago. That does not seem to me to be any solution.

What the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has offered is something that he and I talked about over a year ago. It seems like a very logical way to begin to see if we cannot break the logjam.

There is an island that is about 35 miles long, about 8 miles wide. It contains sufficient land space and habitability that we could have on that is-

land a government in exile in essence set up that President Aristide could occupy, from which he could launch efforts to try to recapture the island in ways that would be much more feasible and practical than we are today engaged in, and it would provide, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] says, a safe haven so those who want to leave Haiti could leave there with a trip of no more than 15 miles, and under our protection, and would not be subject to the kinds of hazards of going to sea.

Mr. Chairman, it makes a lot of sense it seems to me. We have been processing Haitians on Haitian soil for some time who claim refugee status, who claim they are in fear of persecution if they go back. Of course most people who come in and seek that asylum and status do not qualify because they are really economic refugees, but this island would provide a haven, not just for those who are truly in fear of persecution or political or religious reasons, but also for economic refugees who want to leave, and it would provide the impetus of this government in exile to actually come back, and take over and dominate the island of the full Haitian countryside once again.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] for his innovation, for his vision, and I wish that the other side and the President would exercise that same kind of vision. What we should do today is express the sense of the Congress, and that is all this is, as the gentleman from Florida suggests, that we explore this particular idea, that we see if we can make something new and different work instead of going and retreading the same old tired ideas of sanctions that are not working and the threat of military intervention which will not work unless it is carried out, and which, if it is carried out, will only involve the U.S. military in a long-term situation of being bogged down over there that none of us want.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the Dellums proposal and the passage of the Goss amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify a position.

The gentleman is the sponsor of a bill, H.R. 4114, on which I am a cosponsor and all the members of the Congressional Black Caucus are cosponsors, and there are in all more than a hundred cosponsors, and I would like to ask him if he would just clarify for us the similarities and the differences between H.R. 4114 and this amendment. Basically I see a lot of similarities. I just would like to hear him clarify if there are any differences.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, very briefly let me respond to my colleague by saying this amendment embraces the spirit of what we are attempting to do. It is not a duplication in detail because, as the gentleman is well aware, the piece of legislation that we offered is very detailed and very specific. A great deal of thought and effort went into it. This amendment in the nature of a substitute embraces the spirit of that amendment, but it does not get to all of the details that the gentleman and I laid out as we worked through that amendment.

Mr. OWENS. Is H.R. 4114 neutral on the question of military intervention? Does it discuss it at all?

Mr. DELLUMS. It did not discuss it, and the gentleman and I full well know that we thought that the Congressional Black Caucus would take the moral high ground in an area where we were all in agreement.

The place where we were not all in agreement is on the issue of the use of force, and we consciously did not deal with that question, and the gentleman from New York and this gentleman had a handshake agreement that the bill that we would introduce would be silent on that question. So, I am saying that before God and country, the answer to the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. This amendment is not silent on the question. This amendment rules out the use of force, and H.R. 4114 does not deal with the use of force at all.

Mr. DELLUMS. In the nature of a substitute we had fashioned an amendment that addressed the amendment that the gentleman was offering, so we have to address the issue. The gentleman addressed the issue.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good debate, and I think it is on the level that we should be debating such issues as this.

The gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], my friend, she correctly pointed out that both of these bills exclude military intervention, and I say to my colleagues, "Quite clearly, if you want to invade Haiti, if you think that a military intervention by the United States is the right way to go, you simply vote against each amendment, and by the way, as far as I can tell, the language is exactly identical. I don't see any difference in the language between the two bills. But let's look at what is different in the bills."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California, his bill would tighten the economic sanctions. Well, if my colleagues think sanctions are going to work, then that is in the bill. But let

us also look further into what the gentleman from California is talking about. He is talking about when people are escaping from the island, that we supply them lawyers. Read the bill. It says, "Counsel will be appointed as well as Creole-speaking translators."

I say to my colleagues, "If you think we should extend legal aid to the high seas, and to foreign countries, and to Haiti, to advise people on ships that they have a right to come to the United States, you think that's a proper use of American tax dollars, then support the gentleman from California."

I simply do not. I do not think that it is our business here in the Congress to supply these people with lawyers.

Also in the gentleman from California's bill he talks about coming up with land base. Well now, there is only two bases that we know of where we can get it. One is Guantanamo. We tried that, and it was a disaster under the Bush administration, so I do not see that as an alternative. So the only other land base that is left and that every other country in the world has denied us is the United States, and I say, "If you bring them over to the United States, then you bet they will get counsel. They'll get counsel, and they'll get endless appeals, and they are here."

The bottom line is simply this:

"If you think that more Haitians should immigrate to the United States, vote for the Dellums amendment. If you think we should enforce our immigration policy and come up with something new and innovative, vote for the Goss amendment."

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. My colleagues in the House, the current policy or lack of policy ranks probably among the greatest foreign policy failures of any era. If President Kennedy's term in office, after only 2 years, was called Camelot, with Haiti President Clinton's era may be known as Nightmare on Elm Street.

This week we have imposed tighter economic sanctions on the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere. Get this: We are tightening sanctions, economic sanctions, on a country where the average Haitian annual income is \$252 a year. That is 69 cents a day.

That is the proposal this week.

The other proposal this week is to put the Haitians and process them on cruise ships off of Florida. That is not the answer to this problem.

Then we have my colleague, and I know he is well intended, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and he has a just-pretend solution. It is a temporary solution. My colleagues, it is not a permanent solution. The only solution is to restore democracy, to enforce the U.N. accord to enforce the agreement of Governor's Island to restore democracy.

□ 1830

When you say something, you do something. That is going to be the permanent solution, not setting up a temporary government in exile. We must have a multilateral force. We must not sacrifice U.S. Forces until we restore democracy on that island. We are not going to resolve the problems. Until we restore economic development on that island, these people will continue to wash on our shores, dead and alive. And I am telling you, you cannot take temporary solutions.

We must defeat the Goss amendment, and we must not send U.S. troops. We must go back to the accords that have been agreed upon. We must enforce international law or we have made a mockery of the whole process.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goss amendment. On the surface this amendment seems to be an expression of compassion, human decency, and concern for those who would otherwise risk death on the high seas in an attempt to escape our region's most brutal military.

In reality, however, this amendment is far less kind.

Instead of proving a safe haven for those fleeing torture and death, the Goss amendment would have the U.S. Navy be a part of a multilateral effort to dump fleeing Haitians on Ile de Gonave, a mosquito-infested island just west of Port-au-Prince—an island with no infrastructure whatsoever, an island readily accessible to the Haitian military and death squads, an island to which we cannot and must not even consider returning human-beings already panic-stricken and traumatized by the brutality of the military leadership and their followers.

Simply on the basis of human decency and compassion, this amendment should be rejected. Because it falls far short of reflecting sound policy it does not deserve our vote. However, over and above this, all of us in this Chamber are bound to uphold the cardinal tenet of the U.N. Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, now codified in our own Immigration and Nationality Act, which holds that no person, regardless of his country of origin, shall be returned to a country where his life or freedom would be threatened on the basis of his religion, race, or personal belief.

By returning Haitian refugees to Ile de Gonave, Mr. Chairman, we will be returning them to Haiti. And by returning them to Haiti we will be violating United States law and international law.

This we cannot and must not do.

This we cannot and must not do not only because it would be wrong and illegal, but also because there are already policy changes being implemented by the Clinton administration

that make the Goss amendment unnecessary. Specifically, Mr. Chairman, the administration has already committed itself to providing both shipboard and land-based processing for Haitian refugees and, as we speak, arrangements are being made to implement this. Why, then, do we need this amendment? What does this add to current practice and policy? Why should we embark upon a path that is so patently inhuman, and so clearly in violation of current law?

Mr. Chairman, during recent weeks, when the national focus on United States-Haiti refugee policy was at its most intense, the State Department, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and all other pertinent United States agencies looked very carefully at a number of variations on the basic theme of the Goss amendment. The possibility of returning Haitian refugees to some part of that country—to some type of internal safe haven, was looked at, was carefully studied, and was roundly rejected. It was rejected, Mr. Chairman, because it was indefensible, inhumane, illegal, and unworkable.

Do we wish to create a concentration camp for refugees on Haitian soil? And if we did, how would we prevent members of FRAPH—Haiti's death squad—or the Haitian military from entering these camps? Since these individuals would advertise neither their death-squad nor their military affiliation, how on earth would we, when death-squad types claim to be ordinary Haitians attempting to move freely on Haitian soil, prevent them getting to and harming the refugees supposedly in our care? What kind of unworkable logistical nightmare are we bringing upon ourselves and those who would have to implement this policy?

We already know that Haitians returned by our vessels are often taken away by Haitian authorities right at the docks in Port-au-Prince. Some have been tortured, some have disappeared, some have turned up dead. In addition to this, just a few days ago, on the very day that the U.N. trade embargo was put in place, the Haitian military upped the ante by announcing that they will prosecute anyone involved in illegal boat departures. In light of all of this and so much more, we must not even contemplate supporting the Goss amendment.

Most importantly, we must cease investing this much energy, expending this much time, committing such tremendous resources to locking up Haitian refugees when the refugees are but a system of a much broader, deadly problem—the brutality of the Haitian military. As long as the military and the coup supporters are brutalizing the Haitian people, there will be political refugees. Our own Coast Guard attests to the fact that while President Aristide was in power, Haiti's boat peo-

ple dried to a trickle. With the derailment of democracy, their numbers shot skyward. Our challenge, therefore, whether our primary concern is the restoration of democracy or halting refugee flows, is the removal of the military. Our challenge, whether our primary concern is saving the hundreds of millions of dollars that we must now spend to enforce the embargo or halting the military's transshipment of illegal narcotics to our shores is the removal of the military.

The problem is the removal of the military.

If we want an end to refugee flows, Mr. Chairman, we must place maximum pressure on Haiti's military and death squads, and the most effective way to do this is via the speedy enactment of H.R. 4114, without the special exemptions being sought by the President and his Haiti team for Haiti's wealthy coup supporters. And if we want to send a serious message to the Haitian military via sanctions, we must ensure that the Dominican Republic stops its brazen violation of the embargo.

But the Dominican Republic will not comply as long as the United States refuses to use the leverage we have. The Dominican Republic will not comply as long as we refuse to use our foreign assistance, and their sugar and textile quotas to this country as leverage.

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations has documented in grisly detail how General Cedras and his colleagues have unleashed a reign of terror in Haiti. It is also now generally understood that the brutality of the Haitian military was the worst in the western hemisphere, if not the entire world.

This having been said, Mr. Chairman, we must resist any impulse, reject any encouragement, and break any tendency to rationalize returning innocent men, women, and children to Haitian soil and the clutches of the most brutal military in our hemisphere. We must defeat the Goss amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 2 minutes remaining and has the right to close. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Goss amendment on Haiti.

As we debate this issue today, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to one overwhelming fact that each and every one of us must acknowledge. This fundamental truth must form the foundation of all United States policy toward Haiti in the days and weeks to come.

I am referring to the fact that the American people will not assume responsibility for events in Haiti.

I have the utmost respect for my colleagues in this body who feel passionately about the violence and political repression in Haiti. And I have great sympathy for the dilemmas confronted by the administration as it tries to do the right thing.

But if we believe for 1 minute that the American people will support military action in Haiti and the prolonged occupation that will follow, we are kidding ourselves. If we believe for 1 minute that economic sanctions alone will force the Haitian generals from power without such military action, we are deceiving ourselves.

And if we have learned one lesson from our tragic experience in Somalia, it is that turning a humanitarian problem into a military one is a prescription for disaster.

Tougher economic sanctions will only further impoverish Haiti's most vulnerable poor. Sanctions by themselves are not a policy; they represent the admission that we have no real Haiti policy.

That is why I believe PORTER GOSS offers an innovative solution. It offers Father Aristide and the Haitian people the chance to take responsibility for their own destiny. And I believe that, by training police and military officials in the safe haven, we can begin to lay the groundwork for a democratic government in Haiti—without sending in the Marines.

Support the Goss amendment.

□ 1840

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, this is really an interesting and important debate. I am delighted that the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, also advocates not invading Haiti. I think that would be a very serious mistake.

The Cubans have feared that we would invade since 1959. Daniel Ortega used to terrify the Sandinistas and their followers by saying that we were going to invade next month and the month after that. None of those invasions came about, and I would hate to see us invade Haiti.

There are many reasons why it would be ill-advised. Of course, our last experience of spending 19 years there without any real positive result ought to have taught us something.

Now, Mr. Aristide was elected in a democratic election, and he was the overwhelming democratic choice of the people. But the problem is, with democracy, it is more than just a process. It is more than just an election. You have to conduct yourself as a democrat, once you are elected.

You have to respect opposition parties. You have to respect civil rights of other people who disagree with you.

Unfortunately, the evidence indicates that Mr. Aristide failed miserably in that department. This is not the testimony of right-wing, off-the-wall people. I quote the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs of this administration, Alexander Watson, who testified in May of last year before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that, and I quote, "There was ample evidence that President Aristide invited intimidating or violent behavior among his followers."

So we have a poor choice. We have General Cedras and the brutal military or we have a man who was elected who did not conduct himself in a way to reconcile the opposing forces inside Haiti. And so what to do?

It seems to me that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] has got an ideal solution. The Island of Gonava presents a place where the infrastructure could be improved. We can try to get rid of the mosquitos. I dare say the same mosquitos in Haiti populate the Ile of Gonava. But we would not have these people desperately floating in the sea in these rickety boats, clamoring aboard a ship and then, if only 5 percent of them are found to be truly refugees as we are told and the rest have to be returned at the risk of their lives, it seems to me that is a terrible situation.

They are suffering enough from the sanctions. We cannot sanction the military. It is the people, the poor, poverty-stricken people who feel the brunt of the sanctions.

So it seems to me, in this very difficult situation where human beings are suffering, that we ought to avail ourselves of the Ile of Gonava which is just off coast. It provides a land-based place for these hearings on asylum that the gentleman from California asked for in his resolution. It seems to me that it could work and provide a solution to what otherwise is a very, very difficult situation. And so let us understand that democracy is important, but it is more than simply getting elected. After all Hitler was elected when he first came in in 1933. But he certainly did not conduct himself as a democrat thereafter.

The people of Haiti deserve freedom, dignity, a standard of living that is decent and that can be provided by reestablishing democracy but to do it in a way that does not invite them to drown at sea trying to clamor aboard ships and have asylum hearings.

I support the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] enthusiastically.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I just have to respond to the gentleman from Illinois who just spoke. How in God's name he could start to compare Adolf Hitler with President Aristide, how could he possibly say that the

choice of the people of Haiti is between a criminal-like Cedras and a man, a respected Catholic priest like Aristide who may have made some mistakes. But to compare them, to put them in the same category, I think, is horrendous.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I do not compare Hitler with Aristide.

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

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said there was a choice.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I do not compare them as people. What I suggest is getting elected does not mean you are a democrat. That is my point. Hitler was elected in 1933. Aristide was elected but being a democrat is more than just being elected. If the analogy is imperfect, maybe the gentleman can suggest other people who got elected but once in office did not conduct themselves as democrats.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I can respond by using the saying of the Jesuit teachers who taught the gentleman as well as me that most analogies limp. The gentleman's has no legs whatsoever.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He is very perceptive about orthopedic problems.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little bit about facts. We seem to have gotten away from them.

First of all, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] said this is going to be some kind of a big international detente. It is not. We are talking about the U.N.—OAS participation, as we are in the Dellums-Hamilton amendment. The same type of thing we are dealing with, human rights and peacekeeping down there now. No big thing there. I am just trying to get away from the stigma of the U.S. Marines, which the Haitians remember those 19 years of occupation.

Talking about water, no water on the Ile of Gonava. There are 88,000 people out there. I do not know what they are doing for water. I know there is a water problem in Florida. There is a dry season and a wet season. No access. There is a port, Anse A Galets. It is there. Boat traffic goes in and out every day, right there.

There is no airfield. There is no military. There is only 100 or less soldiers there. That is why we like it as a safe haven.

The question about we are going to have to pay for it. Wrong. This is Hai-

tians doing it for Haitians in that area. We are not talking about U.S. costs here and, in fact, if there are costs, I would suggest they come out of the fund that is used to support President Aristide in Washington in the manner in which he is living right now. That will be more than sufficient to pay for this.

Third, going to the Aristide question, our proposal allows for Aristide to come back. I think that is important, because down on I-95, the other day, we had a demonstration in Florida that said, a bunch of Haitians saying, "Look, we want to go back to Haiti and we want Aristide to go with us." And that is what my plan does. That is why I think it is important.

Those are the facts.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] said that there may be some hidden policy here, we do not want any Haitians in Florida.

□ 1850

Mr. Chairman, we have lots of Haitians in Florida. The welcome mat is out. The problem is the Krome Detention Center is full. It is full. There is no room for anybody else, so what do we do? Build another Krome Detention Center? That is not going to solve the problem for the Haitians who are leaving by the thousands now every week. That does not work, either.

What we have to face up to is the fact that the President's policy has not worked. It has made it worse. It absolutely polarized the right wing opposition. It has ruined the economy of the country. It has destroyed the quality of life for all Haitians except the military, so let us recognize the fact that it is a failed policy. Let us try something that might work better.

There is no U.S. Navy, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] involved in this, Mr. Chairman. This is a 280 square mile island. I believe it is a true safe haven. I do not know that it is any more mosquito-ridden than any place in Florida, any other place.

Having said those things, I honestly believe my amendment gives a better chance for the Haitians and democracy in Haiti. I ask for support for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 1½ minutes to close debate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss], and I ask my colleagues to support the amendment we offer as a substitute.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Goss amendment. I have all

the respect in the world for the gentleman, and certainly believe that his ideas as it relates to this solution should always be made available to the President.

However, I rise because I think it is an insult to democracies all over the world when some of our friends in this House find it in their hearts to have a double standard for the Government of Haiti. When we find the overwhelming number of people who never had a chance to drink the sweet nectar of democracy willing to risk their lives to vote for this person, I think it is an arrogant double standard for us to now determine what kind of president did they elect.

We, as Republicans and Democrats, may differ, but once we have a President, we do not tolerate foreigners to insult the intelligence of American voters to tell us what type of President we have.

I go further to say if this was in any other country, in any other continent, I do not think we would have the arrogance to talk about the ability of that president to govern. It is not our job to like or dislike people who have been elected democratically and to raise that type of issue in a discussion as to what is best for the United States. I think it lowers the credibility of this great House of Representatives.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Goss amendment as you are aware, the United States intervened in Haiti from 1915 to 1934. The initial landings made by American Marines were to restore order following a coup and to restore a government to Haiti that was friendly toward the United States. The result was that Haiti was a virtual protectorate of the United States for 19 years.

Our extended involvement in Haiti during the early part of this century failed to bring about any real reforms. Rather, it fostered great resentment towards our Nation for conducting "gun-boat diplomacy" that survives to this day. It serves as a prime example of the difficulties of "enforcing democracy" in a country that has no history of democratic ideals.

It is unlikely that military intervention will solve Haiti's problems. Severe poverty has divided that nation's affluent political and military elite from the average citizen since the country was founded. These cultural and economic problems were noted during our previous involvement in Haiti earlier this century. Unable to change the system after years of occupation then, it will be extremely difficult for the United States to bring about any real change now.

As a result, I am hesitant to use American military power to force the return of Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power. Our State Department has indicated that during Aristide's short tenure in power, he used political violence and approved human rights abuses against his opposition. To enforce his return only condones such actions and turns a blind eye to a growing segment of the Haitian people who no longer support his return.

The United States only vital national security interest in Haiti is that of stemming the tide of

immigration to our southern shores. Refugees fleeing that island nation are forced to negotiate treacherous waters in unseaworthy craft, only to be returned to Port-au-Prince. The President's recent decision to begin screening those fleeing Haiti again will only encourage more Haitians to undertake this dangerous journey.

Yet it is clear that something must be done. This amendment offers a bold and creative approach to the problems of Haiti. Placing Mr. Aristide and his supporters on the Isle de la Gonave "demagnetizes" United States shores by creating a safe haven to Haitian refugees on Haitian soil. It provides a unique opportunity to return the elected Government of Haiti to Haiti without direct military intervention.

This proposal also fosters democracy in Haiti by providing a boost to the morale of Aristide supporters. With Aristide back in Haiti, the people of that impoverished nation will have an alternative to the military dictatorship currently in place. This is a meaningful alternative to military intervention and to refugee screening on the high seas.

This is a humanitarian option as well. It has become clear that the U.N. imposed embargo on Haiti is not hurting the perpetrators in Haiti. Rather it hurts those already suffering from the abject poverty of that nation. This measure will allow for the safe introduction to humanitarian relief to the supporters of Aristide without the fear of reprisals by the military dictatorship.

Mr. Chairman, there are few good options in Haiti. However, the least desirable and least responsible is that of disengagement. The Goss amendment offers us a creative solution to a difficult problem. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will announce that pursuant to clause 2(c) and rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for an electronic vote, if ordered, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—191

Abercrombie	Berman	Brown (OH)
Ackerman	Bishop	Camp
Andrews (ME)	Blackwell	Cantwell
Andrews (TX)	Bonior	Clay
Barca	Borski	Clayton
Barcla	Brooks	Clement
Becerra	Brown (CA)	Clyburn
Beilenson	Brown (FL)	Coleman

Collins (IL)	Kennedy	Reynolds	Inhofe	Mica	Schiff	Baker (LA)	Greenwood	Myers
Collins (MI)	Kennelly	Richardson	Istook	Michel	Sensenbrenner	Ballenger	Gunderson	Nussle
Conyers	Kildee	Roemer	Johnson (CT)	Miller (FL)	Shaw	Barcia	Hancock	Orton
Coppersmith	Klecza	Romero-Barcelo	Johnson (GA)	Minge	Shays	Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Oxley
Costello	Klein	(PR)	Johnson, Sam	Molinari	Shuster	Bartlett	Hastert	Packard
Coyne	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen	Kanjorski	Mollohan	Skeen	Barton	Hayes	Parker
de Lugo (VI)	Kopetski	Rose	Kaptur	Moorhead	Smith (IA)	Bateman	Hefley	Paxon
DeFazio	Kreidler	Rostenkowski	Kasich	Morella	Smith (MI)	Beilenson	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
DeLauro	LaFalce	Roybal-Allard	Kim	Murtha	Smith (NJ)	Bentley	Herger	Peterson (MN)
Dellums	Lancaster	Rush	King	Myers	Smith (OR)	Bereuter	Hobson	Petri
Derrick	Lantos	Sabo	Kingston	Nussle	Smith (TX)	Bevill	Hoekstra	Pickett
Deutsch	LaRocco	Sanders	Klink	Obey	Snowe	Bilbray	Hoke	Pombo
Diaz-Balart	Laughlin	Sangmeister	Klug	Orton	Solomon	Bilirakis	Holden	Porter
Dixon	Levin	Sawyer	Knollenberg	Oxley	Spence	Billey	Houghton	Portman
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Schenk	Kyl	Packard	Stearns	Blute	Huffington	Pryce (OH)
Durbin	Long	Schroeder	Lambert	Parker	Stenholm	Boehlert	Hunter	Quillen
Edwards (CA)	Lowe	Schumer	Lazio	Paxon	Stump	Boehner	Hutchinson	Quinn
Edwards (TX)	Maloney	Scott	Leach	Peterson (FL)	Sundquist	Bonilla	Hutto	Ramstad
Engel	Mann	Serrano	Lehman	Peterson (MN)	Talent	Boucher	Hyde	Ravenel
English	Manton	Sharp	Levy	Petri	Tanner	Brewster	Inglis	Regula
Eshoo	Margolies-	Shepherd	Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Tauzin	Browder	Inhofe	Ridge
Evans	Mezvinsky	Sisisky	Lewis (FL)	Pombo	Taylor (MS)	Bunning	Istook	Roberts
Farr	Markey	Skaggs	Lightfoot	Porter	Taylor (NC)	Burton	Johnson (CT)	Rogers
Fazio	Matsui	Skelton	Linder	Portman	Thomas (CA)	Buyer	Johnson (GA)	Rohrabacher
Fields (LA)	McDermott	Slattery	Lipinski	Price (NC)	Thomas (WY)	Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Roth
Filner	McHale	Slaughter	Livingston	Pryce (OH)	Thurman	Callahan	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Fingerhut	McKinney	Spratt	Lloyd	Quillen	Torkildsen	Calvert	Kaptur	Rowland
Flake	McNulty	Stokes	Lucas	Quinn	Torricelli	Camp	Kasich	Royce
Foglietta	Meehan	Strickland	Machtley	Ramstad	Traficant	Canady	Kim	Sangmeister
Ford (MI)	Meeke	Studds	Manzullo	Ravenel	Valentine	Castle	King	Sarpalius
Ford (TN)	Menendez	Stupak	Martinez	Reed	Volkmer	Chinger	Kingston	Saxton
Frank (MA)	Mfume	Sweet	Mazzoli	Regula	Vucanovich	Coble	Klein	Schaefer
Frost	Miller (CA)	Swift	McCandless	Ridge	Walker	Collins (GA)	Klug	Schiff
Furse	Mineta	Synar	McCloskey	Roberts	Walsh	Combust	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Gejdenson	Mink	Tejeda	McCollum	Rogers	Weldon	Cooper	Kolbe	Shaw
Gephardt	Moakley	Thompson	McCrery	Rohrabacher	Wilson	Coppersmith	Kyl	Shays
Gilchrest	Montgomery	Thornton	McCurdy	Roth	Wolf	Cox	Lancaster	Shuster
Glickman	Moran	Torres	McDade	Roukema	Wynn	Cramer	Lantos	Skeen
Gonzalez	Murphy	Towns	McHugh	Rowland	Young (AK)	Crane	Laughlin	Smith (IA)
Green	Nadler	Tucker	McInnis	Royce	Young (FL)	Crapo	Laughlin	Smith (MI)
Gutierrez	Neal (MA)	Underwood (GU)	McKeon	Sarpalius	Zeliff	Cunningham	Lazio	Smith (NJ)
Hall (OH)	Neal (NC)	Unsoeld	McMillan	Saxton	Zimmer	Danner	Leach	Smith (OR)
Hamburg	Norton (DC)	Upton	Meyers	Schaefer		Darden	Levy	Smith (TX)
Hamilton	Oberstar	Velazquez				Deal	Lewis (CA)	Snowe
Harman	Oliver	Vento				Dickey	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
Hastings	Owens	Visclosky	Barlow	Fish	Santorum	Dingell	Lightfoot	Spence
Hefner	Pallone	Waters	Barrett (WI)	Grandy	Stark	Doolittle	Linder	Stearns
Hilliard	Pastor	Watt	Faleomavaega	Horn	Washington	Dorman	Lipinski	Stump
Hinchee	Payne (NJ)	Waxman	(AS)	Ortiz	Whitten	Dreier	Livingston	Sundquist
Hochbrueckner	Payne (VA)	Wheat				Duncan	Lloyd	Swett
Hughes	Pelosi	Williams				Dunn	Lucas	Talent
Inslee	Penny	Wise				Ehlers	Machtley	Tanner
Jacobs	Pickle	Woolsey				Emerson	Manton	Tauzin
Jefferson	Pomeroy	Wyden	Messrs. McINNIS, McCLOSKEY, MAZZOLI, DICKS, and CRAMER, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. LIMBGE change their vote from "aye" to "no".			Everett	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (SD)	Poshard	Yates				Ewing	Martinez	Thomas (CA)
Johnson, E.B.	Rahall					Fawell	McCandless	Thomas (WY)
Johnston	Rangel					Fields (TX)	McCollum	Thurman
						Fowler	McCrery	Torkildsen
						Franks (CT)	McCurdy	Torricelli
						Franks (NJ)	McDade	Upton
						Frost	McHale	Valentine
						Gallo	McHugh	Vucanovich
						Gekas	McInnis	Walker
						Gilchrest	McKeon	Walsh
						Gillmor	McMillan	Weldon
						Gilman	McNulty	Wolf
						Gingrich	Meyers	Young (AK)
						Goodlatte	Michel	Young (FL)
						Goodling	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
						Goss	Molinari	Zimmer
						Grams	Moorhead	
							Morella	
							Murphy	

NOT VOTING—11

Barlow
 Barrett (WI)
 Faleomavaega
 (AS)

Fish
 Grandy
 Horn
 Ortiz

Santorum
 Stark
 Washington
 Whitten

□ 1914

Messrs. McINNIS, McCLOSKEY, MAZZOLI, DICKS, and CRAMER, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. LIMBGE change their vote from "aye" to "no".

Messrs. INSLEE, RUSH, GILCHREST, and MFUME changed their vote from "no" to "aye".

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, this rollcall vote is reduced to 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 201, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—223

Allard	Cardin	Franks (NJ)	Ackerman	Archer	Bachus (AL)
Andrews (NJ)	Carr	Gallegly	Allard	Armey	Baesler
Applegate	Castle	Gallo	Andrews (NJ)	Bacchus (FL)	Baker (CA)
Archer	Chapman	Gekas			
Armey	Clinger	Geren			
Bacchus (FL)	Coble	Gibbons			
Bachus (AL)	Collins (GA)	Gillmor			
Baesler	Combust	Gilman			
Baker (CA)	Condit	Gingrich			
Baker (LA)	Cooper	Goodlatte			
Ballenger	Cox	Goodling			
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Gordon			
Bartlett	Crane	Goss			
Barton	Crapo	Grams			
Bateman	Cunningham	Greenwood			
Bentley	Danner	Gunderson			
Bereuter	Darden	Hall (TX)			
Bevill	de la Garza	Hancock			
Bilbray	Deal	Hansen			
Bilirakis	DeLay	Hastert			
Billey	Dickey	Hayes			
Blute	Dicks	Hefley			
Boehlert	Dingell	Herger			
Boehner	Doolittle	Hoagland			
Bonilla	Dornan	Hobson			
Boucher	Dreier	Hoekstra			
Brewster	Hoke	Hoke			
Browder	Dunn	Holden			
Bryant	Ehlers	Houghton			
Bunning	Emerson	Hoyer			
Burton	Everett	Huffington			
Buyer	Ewing	Hunter			
Byrne	Fawell	Hutchinson			
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Hutto			
Calvert	Fowler	Hyde			
Canady	Franks (CT)	Inglis			

NOES—236

NOES—201

Abercrombie	Clayton	Durbin
Andrews (ME)	Clement	Edwards (CA)
Andrews (TX)	Clyburn	Edwards (TX)
Applegate	Coleman	Engel
Barca	Collins (IL)	English
Becerra	Collins (MI)	Eshoo
Berman	Condit	Evans
Bishop	Conyers	Farr
Blackwell	Costello	Fazio
Bonior	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Borski	de la Garza	Filner
Brooks	de Lugo (VI)	Fingerhut
Brown (CA)	DeFazio	Flake
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Foglietta
Brown (OH)	Dellums	Ford (MI)
Bryant	Derrick	Ford (TN)
Cantwell	Deutsch	Frank (MA)
Cardin	Diaz-Balart	Furse
Carr	Dicks	Gejdenson
Chapman	Dixon	Gephardt
Clay	Dooley	Geren

Glickman	McKinney	Sawyer
Gonzalez	Meehan	Schenk
Gordon	Meek	Schroeder
Green	Menendez	Schumer
Gutierrez	Mfume	Scott
Hall (OH)	Mica	Serrano
Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)	Sharp
Hamburg	Mineta	Shepherd
Hamilton	Minge	Sisisky
Harman	Mink	Skaggs
Hastings	Moakley	Skelton
Hilliard	Mollohan	Slattery
Hinchee	Montgomery	Slaughter
Hoagland	Moran	Spratt
Hochbrueckner	Murtha	Stenholm
Hoyer	Nadler	Stokes
Hughes	Neal (MA)	Strickland
Inslee	Norton (DC)	Studds
Jacobs	Oberstar	Stupak
Jefferson	Obey	Swift
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Synar
Johnston	Owens	Taylor (MS)
Kanjorski	Pallone	Tejeda
Kennedy	Pastor	Thompson
Kennelly	Payne (NJ)	Thornton
Kildee	Payne (VA)	Torres
Klecza	Pelosi	Towns
Klink	Penny	Trafficant
Kopetski	Pickle	Tucker
Kreidler	Pomerooy	Underwood (GU)
LaFalce	Poshard	Unsoeld
Lambert	Price (NC)	Velazquez
LaRocco	Rahall	Vento
Lehman	Rangel	Visclosky
Levin	Reed	Volkmer
Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Waters
Long	Richardson	Watt
Lowe	Roemer	Waxman
Maloney	Romero-Barcelo	Wheat
Mann	(PR)	Williams
Margolies-	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson
Mezvinsky	Rose	Wise
Markey	Rostenkowski	Woolsey
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Wyden
Mazzoli	Rush	Wynn
McCloskey	Sabo	Yates
McDermott	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—14

Barlow	Fish	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Gibbons	Santorum
DeLay	Grandy	Stark
Faleomavaega	Horn	Washington
(AS)	Neal (NC)	Whitten

□ 1925

Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. ROEMER changed their vote from "aye" to "no". Mr. DARDEN changed his vote from "no" to "aye".

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule it is now in order to consider the amendment printed in part 5 of House Report 103-520.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SPENCE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: At the end of title X (page 277, after line 2), insert the following new section:

SEC. . CREDIT AGAINST ASSESSMENTS FOR UNITED STATES EXPENDITURES IN SUPPORT OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall, at the time of submission of the budget to Congress for any fiscal year, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the total amount of funds appropriated for national defense purposes for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1994 that were expended

during the preceding fiscal year to support or participate in, directly or indirectly, United Nations peacekeeping activities. Such report shall include a breakdown by United Nations peacekeeping operation of the amount of funds expended to support or participate in each such operation.

(b) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1996, funds may be obligated or expended for payment to the United Nations of the United States assessed share of peacekeeping operations for that fiscal year only to the extent that such assessed share exceeds the total amount identified in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) for the preceding fiscal year, reduced by the amount of any reimbursement or credit to the United States by the United Nations for the costs of United States support for, or participation in, United Nations peacekeeping activities for that fiscal year.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term "United Nations peacekeeping activities" means any international peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace-enforcing, or similar activity that is authorized by the United Nations Security Council under chapter VI or VII of the United Nations Charter.

(2) The term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member in opposition, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

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

Mr. Chairman, the aim of this amendment is simple: Peacekeeping payments to the United Nations would be adjusted to take into account the Defense Department's substantial peacekeeping-related expenditures. The Department of Defense spends millions of taxpayer dollars every year for U.S. participation in and support of United Nations peacekeeping operations. It seems to me we ought to be getting credit at the United Nations for what our Armed Forces do for peacekeeping operations. If the United Nations did not have the United States to turn to every time whenever there is a crisis requiring a show of force, I doubt it would have the power to implement any of its resolutions. Quite frankly, we are just taken for granted, and it is high time our in-kind contributions of any and all kinds of military support be considered as a direct contribution to the United Nations peacekeeping operational expense.

Suffice it to say that we must regain the proper relationship between our

country and the United Nations. The United Nations should be on our side and off our backs. This amendment will start the process of restoring the proper balance between our security needs and the United Nations' various needs. I suggest the United Nations buy a rubber stamp marked "Full credit, U.S.A.," and just stamp it on the next bill they send us with the Defense Department's contribution written in.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this very commonsense amendment.

□ 1930

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was coauthored by the Minority Leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and there was also another coauthor of the amendment, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GILMAN, and myself in an attempt to fix a serious and growing problem concerning how the United Nations taps into the pockets of the American taxpayer.

At first glance, this amendment might appear to be complicated when, in fact, it is really simple and straightforward.

Let me first clarify what this amendment is not. It is not about whether the Defense Department or the State Department ought to pay for the U.S. share of U.N. peacekeeping costs. The House will address this issue later in the debate. Nor is this amendment about whether or not the United States ought to get involved in a particular U.N. peacekeeping operation somewhere around the world. What the amendment is about is requiring that all Department of Defense unreimbursed costs in support of U.N. peacekeeping operations be credited against the peacekeeping bill submitted by the U.N. to the U.S. Government every year.

Mr. Chairman, the costs of U.N. peacekeeping operations have exploded since the late 1980's—from \$37 million in 1988 to an estimated \$4.5 billion this year. Because the United States is billed for approximately one-third of these costs under the U.N.'s assessment formula, the American taxpayer's bill for these United Nations operations has also risen dramatically in the past several years. This trend has created a situation where the magnitude of the U.N. peacekeeping charges passed on to us is rapidly outstripping our ability to pay them. In fact, the estimate of our unpaid U.N. peacekeeping bill, or arrearages, is likely to exceed \$1 billion by the end of this year.

To add insult to injury, the American taxpayer is getting double billed when it comes to U.N. peacekeeping costs. While our unpaid U.N. peacekeeping debt grows, the Department of Defense regularly spends hundreds of millions of dollars in support of U.N. peacekeeping operations—the vast majority of which is never reimbursed by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the administration does not even seek reimbursement for many of these substantial costs incurred by DOD.

For example, within the last year, Congress approved reprogrammings and supplemental

appropriations exceeding \$1 billion to partly offset the costs of the United States operations in Somalia—and even this falls short of adequately paying for DOD's true costs. Similarly, the bulk of DOD's costs to support the United Nations in, over, and around Bosnia today are being paid for out the hide of the military service's operating budgets and will not be reimbursed by the United Nations. Last year alone, the cost of these unreimbursable DOD operations in support of the United Nations exceeded \$1.3 billion, and they are expected to remain at similar levels in the future.

This amendment would simply require that the United States deduct DOD's unreimbursed expenses in support of peacekeeping operations from its annual peacekeeping bill from the United Nations. It is only right to get credit where credit is due.

This amendment is a modest, common sense first step to insert a measure of honest accounting into the process by which the United States pays its peacekeeping bills.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me start by saying I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], for yielding this time to me, and I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], who has been, I think, most generous in his efforts to work out a procedure and a process for a number of very, very difficult issues, and I have often gotten on the floor and complained about some of the rules we get and some of the situations, but I would say that working on this bill has been frankly a very important step toward bipartisanship, and I want to thank Mr. DELLUMS for, I think, an exemplary effort to reach out and to try to actually have time for everybody to explore important issues.

So, in that spirit I want to briefly describe an amendment which we thought was so important that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and I wanted to lead off the conversation on our side, and other members of our leadership, I think, are going to want to join in.

Let me be very clear what this is about. We are going through a period of terrible downsizing in our defense budget. We are cutting beyond bone. We are shrinking below what President Bush thought, we are shrinking below what President Clinton, said was necessary. We are going to weaken America's military over the next 5 years in very significant ways.

Now, when we were building up the military under Presidents Reagan and Bush, Mr. Chairman, we got into the habit of carrying out for the United Nations a whole series of invisible services often involving logistics, air mobility, supplies, command and control, a whole range of things which we just threw in. So, we were about the largest payer to the United Nations of money for peacekeeping. We had been assessed

at 31 percent, and I must thank the appropriate committee member who brought that back down. Hope to bring it down to 25 by something they just adopted. But clearly we are the largest payer in the world of peacekeeping in direct cash.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, there was a hidden subsidy in that a very substantial part of the cost of many of these operations was American C-141's, American C-5's, American C-130's, all of them, by the way, made in de Kalb County, GA, which I represent. But that is not the point. The point is that, when we were a much larger defense system, we could afford these invisible costs.

Now they are not trivial. Look at Somalia, Operation Provide Relief; Yugoslavia, Operation Deny Flight, embargo enforcement and air drops; Southern Iraq, Operation Southern Watch; Northern Iraq, Operation Provide Comfort; Haiti, embargo enforcement. These are not small sums of money. For fiscal 1994 alone, just for fiscal 1994, Congress has already appropriated \$1,200,000,000 in supplemental defense funds to cover such costs and will probably have to come back and approve even more.

Now some examples:

Somalia, \$424 million in United States costs of supporting the United Nations without compensation; Yugoslavia and Bosnia, \$277 million in United States invisible costs without being compensated; Iraq, \$450 million in United States costs without compensation; Haiti, \$48 million in additional and invisible costs to the United States without being able to be reimbursed. So, Mr. Chairman, what is happening is we are both the largest direct payer to United Nations peacekeeping, and we do not get to score any of our own costs as part of the cost of the peacekeeping.

Now all this amendment does, Mr. Chairman, is begin to raise a very serious issue, to wit: "When you're cutting the American defense budget, when you're laying off 15,000 uniformed personnel a month and 10,000 civilian personnel a month in your defense system, when you're shrinking the number of ships, when you're reducing the number of planes, when you're shrinking the number of tanks, when you're weakening America's defense, can you really afford to have an invisible subsidy to the United Nations on top of the money that is already the largest single source for U.N. peacekeeping?"

I do not think so.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] briefly.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman consider the U.N. supported, participated action in Desert Storm to be an action in which the

U.S. Government spend billions of dollars in direct or indirect costs in support of a peacekeeping/peacemaking operation?

Mr. GINGRICH. I think that Desert Storm was a unique moment, as was the Korean war, in both of those cases involving a large theater level conflict. The United Nations provided virtual total leadership and virtual total military capacity while assembling around it a coalition of forces under United Nations command. But the fact is, in both the Korean war and in Desert Shield/Desert Storm, it was American leadership to accomplish American objectives with the support of the United Nations.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I think I am out of time, I am afraid, but I appreciate very much my colleague participating.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding this time to me.

As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Chairman, it prohibits the State Department from paying U.N. peacekeeping assessment unless the Defense Department is fully reimbursed for its support to U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Now I think everybody in this Chamber agrees that the Department of Defense should be reimbursed when appropriate for additional costs it incurs in U.N. peacekeeping operations. There should be no doubt about that. We all accept that. It is my understanding that the Department of Defense today has already been reimbursed by the United Nations for incremental costs in support of peacekeeping operations, and for most of its direct support to peacekeeping, such as provision of equipment in airlift where there are additional costs, and the Department of Defense should receive reimbursement for those additional costs as well. And when those additional costs occur, Mr. Chairman, we have a means to take care of that through supplemental appropriations, and we should. Mr. Chairman, the President has committed himself to seeking supplemental appropriations whenever the Defense Department incurs these costs, and indeed he should, and he has honored that commitment in Somalia and, I think, will do so in the future.

I think the important thing here is not to mix up two issues. The one issue is Defense Department reimbursement. There should be no debate about it. We all agree to it. The other issue is funds the United States is legally required,

committed, to pay the United Nations. Holding U.N. peacekeeping assessments hostage will not reimburse the Defense Department for costs. Holding U.N. peacekeeping funds hostage does mean that the U.N. peacekeeping operations will shut down, and that is what is dangerous about this amendment. Those countries that are contributing troops, the troops will not be paid. They will pull their troops out.

Members who vote for this amendment must understand the consequences, and the consequences are that we will have to shut down peacekeeping operations; for example, in Cyprus. We will pull out peacekeeping forces in the Middle East, right in the middle of the peace process. We will let the violence and the slaughter continue in Rwanda. We will halt the peace process in Angola. We will pull out forces from Kuwait on Saddam Hussein's border.

□ 1940

So this amendment sets a bad precedent. It suggests that every nation is entitled, regardless of U.N. rules, regardless of our commitments, to decide for itself what expenses are incurred in support of peacekeeping, and then to credit all of these expenses against the peacekeeping assessment.

If we claim that any Department of Defense cost remotely connected to peacekeeping must be reimbursed by the United Nations, what will stop the Russians from claiming it is peacekeeping in the Novgorod, and then reducing its payments to the United Nations for peacekeeping?

What would stop countries who are incurring costs as a result of economic embargoes against Serbia, Haiti, Libya, and Iraq from charging those costs against their U.N. assessments?

The bottom line I think is that the United Nations peacekeeping is in the American national interest. It is in our interest that the United Nations does peacekeeping, and not the United States. We do not want to be the cop on the beat around the world. We should pay our peacekeeping assessments and not mix up those assessments with the reimbursement for the Department of Defense.

When the United States decides that it is in the national interest to provide Department of Defense support for peacekeeping, we do and we can contract with the United Nations for reimbursement. Costs beyond normal reimbursement, as in the case of Somalia, should be covered by supplemental appropriations.

As Secretary Christopher has pointed out, what this amendment does is compel the President to make an unacceptable choice. On the one hand, withdraw U.S. military support for these peacekeeping operations; or refuse to comply with our U.N. charter obligations to pay for our peacekeeping activities.

That is an unacceptable choice, and the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a slick way to avoid paying our bills to the United Nations. This amendment is a little too cute. It pulls the rug out from under the United Nations—the problem is: We are standing on that same rug.

This amendment is a clever attempt to make the United Nations pay for U.S. military operations—for operations we want to conduct and for which we sought U.N. endorsement. This amendment tells the United Nations: "Anytime you endorse an American operation, we're gonna make you pay for it." Well, what do you suppose will be the U.N. response: "In that case, you Americans don't get a U.N. endorsement." The result is this:

First, we still have to pay for the costs of the operation.

Second, we are forced to act as a lone wolf without U.N. endorsement, making it harder to defend the operation.

Mr. Chairman, let's look at what kind of military operations the United States is engaged in today in our national interest with U.N. endorsement. All of these operations are authorized by the U.N. Security Council. But none of them are U.N.-assessed operations because we choose to run them as U.S.-commanded operations. Here's the list. Off Haiti, Operation Support Democracy.

Around former Yugoslavia, four different efforts—Operation Deny Flight, Operation Sharp Guard, Operation Provide Promise, and Sanctions Against Missions—all designed to reduce the conflict there.

Over Iraq, Operation Southern Watch is the effort to stop Iraqi flights over southern Iraq and includes the blockade enforcement operation in the Red Sea. Operation Provide Comfort is the effort to stop flights in the north and to protect the Kurds there.

In Somalia, a United States amphibious readiness group consisting of 3 ships and over 4,000 personnel is deployed in the Indian Ocean, by our choice.

In the Middle East, the Western Sahara, and in Mozambique, the U.S. military provides a modicum of support for U.N. operations at a cost of about \$100,000 each.

Mr. Chairman, the projected costs for this year for these operations—U.S. run but U.N. endorsed—less U.N. reimbursements to the United States, total more than \$900 million. That amount would almost wipe out the anticipated arrearages for U.N. peacekeeping operations, which are almost \$1 billion.

Last September, the President promised the world that the United States would pay its assessed contributions in full. Other U.N. member nations are watching whether the United States meets its responsibilities. This amendment says we won't.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is harmful. I strongly urge Members to oppose and defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 24, 1994.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to express my strong opposition to a proposed amendment on peacekeeping to the Department of Defense Authorization bill. This amendment, were it to become law, would have disastrous consequences for the ability of the United States to advance our interests through the United Nations.

Except in rare circumstances where the United States waives reimbursement from the UN, the Department of Defense is reimbursed for goods and services it provides to UN assessed peacekeeping activities. The U.S. also receives the same per soldier reimbursement as other countries when we participate in peacekeeping operations. This amendment, however, would go far beyond these arrangements.

It is important for the Congress to understand that U.S. participation in UN-sponsored activities, such as the non-fly zone over Bosnia and the maritime interdiction forces around Haiti, Iraq and the former Yugoslavia, are all undertaken voluntarily to advance our national interests. This has been the case under both Democratic and Republican Administrations.

This amendment, however, would compel the President to make an unacceptable choice: withdraw U.S. military support for these and other operations or refuse to comply with our UN Charter obligations to pay for UN peacekeeping activities. The UN peacekeeping system already is under enormous financial strain, and this amendment could lead to its collapse.

The Administration believes that peacekeeping operations can be a useful tool for our foreign policy. We have recently completed a comprehensive review of U.S. participation in UN peacekeeping operations, and we are working to address many of the concerns raised by this amendment, particularly reducing the cost of these operations.

Therefore, I urge the Congress to defeat this amendment.

Sincerely,

WARREN CHRISTOPHER.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to another coauthor of the amendment, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, for some time now, the United States has been providing what amounts to pro bono support for U.N. peacekeeping activities. But what is pro bono for the United Nations is double billing to the American people. Under an antiquated assessment system that does not take into account economic realities of the last 30 years, including the growth of Germany, Japan, and China, the United States is assessed over 31 percent of the United Nations' peacekeeping budget.

In the State Department Authorization Act recently signed into law, Congress took steps to force the administration to address this inequity and reduce the proportion of our assessment.

Today we have an opportunity to address another inequity in the U.N. assessment formula. When President Bush sent armed forces on a mission to Somalia in December 1992, it was to enforce a U.N. Security Council resolution. Although our forces were fulfilling a U.N. mandate, the costs were all absorbed by the American taxpayer.

Hear me, the American taxpayer. Only after the mission was formally turned back over to the United Nations were the costs shared by other countries in addition to ourselves. The administration ultimately requested a supplemental appropriation of \$750 million to cover part of the cost of the mission, choosing to absorb the other costs in the regular Department of Defense budget.

We passed that supplemental spending bill earlier this year. We did not ask for nor did we receive from the United Nations financial credit for this substantial contribution, and our U.N. assessment remained unchanged.

This is not the first time we have undertaken this double burden, and I fear it will not be the last. As I speak, we are expending substantial resources from our distressed Department of Defense budget to pay for several missions that directly support U.N. operations.

Our participation in the no-fly zone over Bosnia is financed wholly by the United States. So is our enforcement of the embargo on arms for Bosnia, which the President says he does not support, as is the broader embargo against Serbia and Montenegro. We are also paying for our part of Operation Provide Comfort and Southern Watch in Iraq.

In fact, over the years we have funded a substantial amount of activity in support of U.N. peacekeeping operations, above and beyond our bloated 31-plus percent for those operations. The amendment before us today will give us proper credit for those costs and would end the practice that unfairly burdens the Pentagon with costs contracted for by the State Department.

Most importantly, its adoption will be one more step in winning fair treatment for the American taxpayer.

□ 1950

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

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

I think it bears pointing out that the United States is reimbursed by the United Nations for most direct DOD support to peacekeeping activities, such as when we provide equipment,

when we provide airlift. We are paid for that. And when we are participants in a peacekeeping effort, we are reimbursed on the same basis as other countries which contribute troops to the peacekeeping.

This amendment would take us much further along. It is really a unilateral decree that will allow us to charge the U.N. for missions that we have undertaken, allow the United States to offset against its share of peacekeeping operations the assessment delivered to us, what we have spent on U.N. endorsed but nevertheless not directly sponsored undertakings.

There are dozens of different problems with this, but let me just highlight several.

First of all, it would violate our legal obligations under the United Nations charter to pay our assessment in accordance with the rules that all countries who are parties to that charter follow. Great nations ought to keep their word. It is as simple as that. We should abide by the charter as long as we are a party to it.

Second, this amendment, if we got away with it, would invite other countries to do the same, so the British and the French and the Italians and others who are now involved in enforcing the no-fly zone, say in Bosnia, they could do the same. They could credit their assessments.

Third, the unilateral nature of this amendment, coupled with its invitation to fiscal anarchy in the United Nations, would weaken our ability to work out other reforms in the United Nations, including a reduction in our peacekeeping assessments.

The Secretary of Defense has written the Speaker of the House a letter today in which he said, "All of these things, taken together, mean that this amendment would ensure disaster for a U.N. peacekeeping system already teetering on the financial brink."

Mr. Chairman, we should defeat this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. Today, the defense budget faces a double threat. First, the Clinton administration has embarked on a plan to cut from Defense, over the next 5 years, \$127 billion more than the amount the Bush administration proposed over the same period. The second threat is the idea, firmly embraced by the administration, that the defense budget is a ready pool of funds that can be raided for any project deemed necessary by the President.

Funding for peacekeeping has become one of those projects. Mr. Clinton has made the United Nations a centerpiece of his foreign policy. Deferring to this international body on a variety of foreign policy crises, we have seen the folly of this approach from Bosnia, to Somalia, to Haiti.

Yet today, we see the rapid expansion of United Nations peacekeeping operations

around the world. With this expansion, we have seen the extensive involvement of the U.S. military in support of the U.N. This support is not without costs. By the end of this year, the United States will be in arrears to the United Nations in excess of \$1 billion. In fact, the President has asked for a supplemental peacekeeping appropriation of \$640 million for 1994.

Historically, the bills for peacekeeping operations have been paid from the State Department budget. But in addition, the United Nations has benefited from the support of U.S. military forces deployed overseas. These forces are often sent on U.N. missions without reimbursement. Their costs are paid from the individual services' operations and maintenance accounts.

Somalia is a prime example. Last year, this Congress passed a supplemental appropriation bill to pay for the ill-fated United States participation in the U.N. mission in Somalia. This cost the American taxpayer over \$1 billion. Today, in Bosnia, most of the costs accrued in support of that operation come from the operations and maintenance fund of the individual services. It is unlikely that these costs will be reimbursed by the United Nations.

This amendment is simple. It stops this drain on the defense budget by requiring the United States to deduct from its annual U.N. peacekeeping bill the money the Department of Defense spends in support of U.N. peacekeeping operations. I think this is only fair.

Mr. Chairman, the free ride is over. The United Nations should no longer be allowed to raid our defense budget without reimbursement. I strongly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the question here is fairness, purely and simply. Why not treat us fairly?

Do not be fooled. We are paying twice to the United Nations for these peacekeeping operations. Number one, we are paying three times, almost, what Japan pays in outright assessments, 31.7 percent. Almost four times what Germany pays. Not only that, but then we send our aircraft carriers to the scene or we send our planes to the scene and incur these exorbitant extra costs on top of that.

We are told that this year alone that is \$1.5 billion, so we are paying 31.7 percent of the total cost. Then on top of that, we are paying another \$1.5 billion in logistical support. What is fair?

The true cost to the American taxpayer this year, 1994, for peacekeeping is really \$2.7 billion.

Now, we are not just talking about chicken feed anymore, Mr. Chairman. We used to be, in 1988. But look at the growth in the assessed cost for U.N. peacekeeping over the years.

Here is 1988. Here is 1994, estimated, and still going on up.

We are involved now in 19 peacekeeping missions in the world, and we are paying much more than a third of the cost. I do not think that is fair.

What does the United Nations do when we try to correct that? They refuse.

We asked permission for years to lower our assessment to just 25 percent, merely twice what Japan pays, the next highest. They refused.

They refused to allow us to credit against what we pay these extra costs militarily that comes out of our defense budget. And they refused our request for an independent inspector general to tell us how the books are kept.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that we stood on our hind feet and said, this is enough.

Now, where does the money come from, Mr. Chairman? It comes from my appropriations subcommittee that also appropriates the funds for the war on crime, the war on drugs. Every penny that we send in this fund here comes out of the same fund out of which we are trying to fight the war on crime. That explains itself, because the President this year, in requesting funds for the war on crime, decreases the FBI by 300 people, decreases the DEA by 800 people because of this element right here.

I ask for fairness. I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding time to me.

I am not going to give my own words. I am going to quote from a letter from Secretary of Defense Perry.

He says:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Representative GINGRICH's peacekeeping amendment.

He goes on to say:

The impact on U.S. foreign policy and U.S. leadership in the post-cold war era would be devastating. This amendment would jeopardize missions such as our peacekeeping operations in Cyprus, our sanction enforcement in Iraq, our U.N. peacekeeping in southern Lebanon.

And again I quote, he says:

In addition to bringing about the virtual collapse of U.N. peacekeeping, withholding payments to our U.N. assessment would create a serious violation of our treaty obligations under the U.N. charter. Peacekeeping operations are an important tool for protecting and advancing U.S. interests in the post-cold war.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the Secretary of Defense, William Perry, and say vote "no" on the Gingrich amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining amount of time on both sides of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 18½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New

York [Mr. GILMAN], another coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Michel-Gingrich-Hyde-Gilman-Spence amendment. This amendment will, for the first time, require that our Nation's peacekeeping payments to the United Nations be adjusted to take account of in-kind contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations by the Department of Defense.

The logic of this amendment is simple and powerful. Every year, DOD spends millions of dollars for U.S. participation in and support for U.N. peacekeeping operations, with little or no reimbursement from the United Nations. And every year, the United Nations has been assessing us for 31.7 percent of the total cost of its peacekeeping operations.

That's a bill that traditionally has been paid in cash by the State Department. This amendment requires that DOD's peacekeeping expenditures be offset against our U.N. peacekeeping assessment before the State Department makes cash payments to the United Nations. In effect, the United States will begin to pay part of its U.N. bill in kind rather than in cash.

This is an important, long overdue innovation that addresses a growing problem.

Because the number and cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations has been growing, the amount of our annual assessment has been growing as well, and increasingly the United States has fallen behind in its payments. For this fiscal year, \$401 million has been appropriated for assessed peacekeeping costs. Even after State pays this \$401 million to the United Nations, however, it is estimated that by the end of this fiscal year our total arrearage to the U.N. for assessed peacekeeping costs will exceed \$1 billion.

That's why the President has asked for a supplemental peacekeeping appropriation this year of \$670 million—that is, \$670 million in addition to the \$401 million already appropriated. And even if that supplemental appropriation is approved, we will end the year with at least a \$350 million arrearage.

This is a situation that only promises to become worse. Our U.N. peacekeeping assessment for fiscal 1995 is likely to be in the neighborhood of \$1.2 to \$1.3 billion. But Congress has authorized only \$510 million for assessed peacekeeping contributions in 1995. So, without some supplemental appropriations, our total arrearage at the end of 1995 could be as high as \$1.8 billion.

While these bills are piling up, the Defense Department has been incurring huge unreimbursed costs for participating in and supporting U.N. peacekeeping operations.

For the failed peacekeeping operation in Somalia, for example, Congress had to approve a reprogramming

and a supplemental appropriation totaling over \$1 billion to cover DOD's unreimbursed costs.

Similarly, DOD is now racking up large unreimbursed costs for its operations in, over, and around Bosnia in support of United Nations peacekeeping activities there. It is estimated that those costs will total approximately \$275 million this year.

The time has come to restore some balance to the equation. If the United Nations is going to continue piling peacekeeping debts on us, it is only fair that we develop a way to charge back to the United Nations the costs that DOD incurs in supporting peacekeeping operations.

This amendment does not prohibit our Nation's involvement in U.N. peacekeeping.

The Michel-Gingrich-Hyde-Gilman-Spence amendment simply provides a mechanism for the United Nations to credit our Nation's costs against the U.N. assessment. It is a long-overdue step that deserves support.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

□ 2000

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe what I am hearing. I ask my colleagues to read the text of this amendment and understand what would have happened if this had been in effect 3 years ago.

First, understand this. We can try and dissociate ourselves all we want from U.N. peacekeeping operations, but the fact is there is not one peacekeeping operation going on now that the United States could not have killed at its inception by exercising its power of veto. The Security Council is the only body empowered to have the United Nations authorize any peacekeeping operations. We can veto anything at the Security Council.

Secondly, if this had been in effect 3 years ago, when we chose to undertake Desert Shield and then Desert Storm, and we sought the U.N. endorsement of that proposition and received the U.N. endorsement, with a lot of great and excellent diplomatic work by the previous administration, and we spent, what, \$50, \$60, \$70 billion, much of which was reimbursed, and there is no reference, by the way, to the fact that reimbursements come off of the credit, but whatever we spent there, billions of dollars in direct and indirect U.S. costs in this operation, if this resolution had been in effect at that time, for 25 years in the future we would never pay one dollar into any approved U.N. peacekeeping operation.

What is the consequence of that? It is either we shrink from our superpower status totally, and totally disengage ourselves from the world, and yes, then we would have more money for cops on the streets and the crime bill and the FBI and a lot of domestic programs. We could also repeal our defense budget while we are at it as well, and have even more money for doing that. But a superpower does not operate under that kind of situation.

Second, we would either remove ourselves from every consideration internationally or we would find ourselves unilaterally involved in maintaining the peace in Cyprus, in monitoring human rights in the election process in Salvador, in doing all these unilaterally, because the Security Council would never undertake a single international peacekeeping operation because the United States would not be paying. We would be taking credits off of our obligations and our assessments in violation of the charter, notwithstanding the fact we could block any specific peacekeeping operation, because we had provided indirect or direct costs to some operation we thought was worthy of our support.

Let me tell the Members, I think enforcing the no fly zone in northern Iraq and protecting the Kurds in the consequence of Desert Storm in a worthwhile expenditure, and yes, we are doing it, and yes, the U.S. sanctioned it. I do not think that should mean that because of that we ask the United Nations to pull out of Cambodia and we ask the United Nations to pull out of Cyprus and we ask the United Nations to pull out of El Salvador. That is crazy.

Mr. Chairman, the only salvation, I think, in this amendment is I truly believe that the sponsors of it do not really want it to happen. They want to register some criticism of U.S. foreign policy in the area of peacekeeping, but the way to do that and the way to deal with equity in the sanctions is to only appropriate the arrearages on the condition that those ratios come down to a more realistic level, that we meet the 25 percent.

That is exactly what we did in the State Department authorization bill that was signed into law a month ago. That is exactly what the appropriators are talking about doing. That is the right way to get some sense of efficient management and fair participation in international peacekeeping.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the minority leader characterized this amendment as one of common sense. That is exactly what it is. When it comes to U.N. peacekeeping efforts, the United States contributes an incredible

amount of money through logistics, air power, lethal weaponry, and manpower, in addition to cash. The soldiers, the sailors, marines and airmen who risk their lives to provide the wherewithal to keep indigenous people from killing themselves benefit from all of these contributions.

Over the years, I have visited United States soldiers sweating in the Sinai, airmen feeding the peoples of Bosnia and northern Iraq, marines and sailors in Somalia, troops in Desert Storm, the DMZ in Korea, the war zone in Beirut, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Through the United Nations, America feeds and nurtures and protects people around the world.

Because of earlier commitments, we provide \$75 million for peacekeeping process in the Sinai, in Cyprus, and in Lebanon. That is under the appropriation bills, the Foreign Aid Subcommittee, apart from the provisions of this bill. Again, apart from the provisions of this bill, under the State-Justice appropriation bill, we have been contributing over 33 percent of all current U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Recently, we trimmed down that figure, all the way down to 32 percent, still the most significant proportion of any country in the world. We have 80,000 troops stationed in some 18 U.S. peacekeeping operations around the world, with some eight more countries on the planning boards.

The costs of these operations are borne solely by United States taxpayers, in addition to the 33 percent of the U.N. operations, which costs alone, for Somalia, \$1 billion last year, all in addition to the \$75 billion in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. Chairman, we also contribute hundreds of millions of dollars to multilateral banks. We spend a total of \$14 billion in our foreign aid bill, which is not even discussed here today, for foreign aid of all kinds around the world. It is not too much to ask the United Nations to give us financial credit for the costs of our military effort on behalf of world peace.

Enough is enough. Our taxpayers are overburdened. This would be a very good place to lower the cost of their generosity. The burden of being the beacon of liberty throughout the world should warrant at least some sensible credit and recognition. Accordingly, I urge the adoption of this common sense amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, colleague, and neighbor, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is here, because he misspoke, and I would like to correct a statement

that he made, and I am sure he will agree with me.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have 80,000 troops in U.N. peacekeeping operations around the world, which is what the gentleman said, I am sure inadvertently. There are 80,000 U.N. peacekeeping troops around the world from many countries. We have 800 U.S. troops in U.N. peacekeeping operations.

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

Mr. LANTOS. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman should explain that to the 30,000 United States troops in Korea or the 500 in Macedonia alone, a very small portion of the people.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, the gentleman knows as well as I do that the United States forces in Korea are not part of U.N. peacekeeping operations. The gentleman knows that as well as I do.

The fact is that the small country of Norway has more peacekeepers in U.N. peacekeeping operations than we do. We have 800, 800 out of the 80,000 peacekeepers who happen to be members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

As I listened to this debate on both sides, I tried to decide what are the issues on which we agree, so let me begin with those.

Mr. Chairman, No. 1, I take it we all agree that the United States pays too large a share of U.N. peacekeeping operations. The Japanese, the Germans, the Kuwaitis, the Saudis, many others should pay a large share of U.N. peacekeeping costs, and we should reduce our payment. We should do so in an orderly fashion.

No. 2, very important, as my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] pointed out, there is not a single U.N. peacekeeping operation any place on this planet that we could not have stopped with our veto. Every single U.N. peacekeeping operation is in existence with our concurrence, approval, and vote. There is not a single one of the 18 that we objected to.

□ 2010

No. 3. We do not wish to be the policeman of this world. We want to the maximum possible extent other countries participating in peacekeeping activities.

Mr. Chairman, if I may use a local analogy. What the amendment from the other side proposes is something like this: Let us assume that you are in a city and the city taxes are \$1,000. This \$1,000 is budgeted for the police department and the fire department and the street cleaning department. That is what the city runs on. But you also decide without concurrence or approval by anybody that you will buy \$1,000 worth of equipment for a playground and you do it. Nobody approved

of it, nobody budgeted for it. Nobody said that is what we are going to spend our monies on, and then you say having spent \$1,000 for equipment on the playground, I will not now pay my city taxes.

Mr. Chairman, this is absurd, and every one of my colleagues on the other side knows that it is absurd.

If this absurd proposal is accepted, I tell Members what will happen next. Russia is currently having troops in Georgia to supplement a U.N. peacekeeping observer team. If we do what the gentleman is proposing, nothing prevents Russia from charging as much of the Russian Army to U.N. peacekeeping obligations as they choose. Nothing prevents the French and the British from charging their cost of preventing overflights in Yugoslavia to their peacekeeping costs.

If my colleagues want to destroy the peacekeeping activity of the United Nations, vote for this ill-advised amendment. If my colleagues want others to carry their fair share of the load, vote against it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. This debate is amazing to me. As I recall last week, we were on the floor in a similar debate. The big issue then was called burdensharing. Many of my colleagues from the other side who spoke in support of the burdensharing amendment were the same ones who got up now and said that the U.N. has to be paid for from Japan and Europe and other countries, but we cannot pull the plug out from under the United Nations at this point in time.

Mr. Chairman, where were these people when we argued in support of President Clinton's partnership for peace which he has unveiled in support of our NATO allies, when we pulled the rug out from under the President last week in this body? I stood up on the floor of the House and I said I want to defend the President, and I want to support Secretary Christopher and Secretary Perry. I want to give them the flexibility.

I cannot believe some of my colleagues who got up and quoted the Secretary of Defense today who laughed at the Secretary last week. That is absolutely beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not curtail the leadership of President Clinton. What it simply says is that when we respond to a U.N. operation, we should be given credit for our cost. I think the American taxpayers would agree with that. We are not saying we should not comply and help out in these U.N. operations. We are saying we should be given credit for it.

I ask my colleagues that supported the burdensharing amendment last week, here is your chance. This is

burdensharing at its best. This is our opportunity to say to Japan, to France, to Germany, cough up the money, support the United Nations financially. Do not make the United States pay for the cost of all these missions that we get dragged into by the U.N. leadership.

Mr. Chairman, this is the real burdensharing amendment. People of America, watch this vote closely. Because what we are saying is we want the President to have flexibility. If the President wants to send our troops on a U.N. mission anyplace in the world, we will support him, but we think our allies through the United Nations should help pay the cost.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would counter by yielding 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I think we have to be very practical about this money. The chances are, we are not going to have any peacekeeping money in our bill this year. But for us to try to make this an issue when it is actually not an issue is not appropriate.

I remember vividly going down to the White House when President Bush wanted to go to Somalia. I was the only one who spoke up and said, "I don't think this is as good operation." We forced the United Nations into that operation. If we would have had them take an assessment from other countries and pay for the peacekeeping mission based on that assessment, it would have bankrupted the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, we use the United Nations to our advantage. We sometimes use the United Nations to legitimize our military effort. President Bush did it. President Clinton has inherited it. We have not paid our full U.N. assessment, and it is embarrassing to the United States for us not to pay the legitimate assessment we agreed to.

Mr. Chairman, for us to try by subterfuge to say now that, even though there is an agreement, "Well, wait a minute, we want you to give us credit for our flights into Bosnia because we don't have any troops on the ground," and they should reimburse us for some of this action is not appropriate. It certainly should be discussed when it is legitimate. But to say the flights into Bosnia which are humanitarian aid and in our interest, which we want to do and all of us support, are going to be part of the cost of operating the official U.N. peacekeeping mission, it is just wrong.

From a practical standpoint, we are behind in our regular assessment. I believe our assessment is too high, but we have to negotiate it. We cannot unilaterally say to the people in the United Nations when we use them whenever we want that the assessment is too high and we want to pay in kind.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members of this Congress to be very careful

and to vote against this amendment, which sounds good on the surface. Many of us do not want to take peacekeeping money out of the defense budget, and we are trying to avoid that. It now comes out of the State Department budget. But I urge the Members of Congress not to try to pay for peacekeeping in this high-handed method.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the gentleman who is walking away from the microphone would like to listen, but in response to the gentleman from California, I think it is ironic that he would count only 800 United States troops in U.N. peacekeeping operations when the gentleman who just spoke has visited the 30,000 in Korea who are there for peacekeeping, the 12,000 to 14,000 troops in Bosnia are there for peacekeeping. They are feeding people. The 17,000 people who are involved in the feeding of the Kurds in northern Iraq where we had the tragic accident are involved in peacekeeping.

Mr. Chairman, it is ludicrous for the gentleman from California to say that we only have 800 troops involved in peacekeeping efforts. We have thousands and thousands and thousands of troops engaged in helping people around the world to survive. All we are saying is that those people that are involved in those operations should be given some credit against the incredible fees that the United Nations assesses us for other peacekeeping operations.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, knows every bit as well as I do that there is a very precise definition of U.N. peacekeeping troops. Those are troops around the globe who are in various locations as a result of United Nations Security Council action. There are 80,000 such troops around the globe, of which 79,200 are not members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, there are lots of American troops in many parts of the globe. We used to have hundreds of thousands as members of NATO all over Europe. They kept the peace. But they were not there as U.S. peacekeeping troops.

I think it is important to get our terminology straight. Our troops in Korea are there to keep the peace.

□ 2020

They are there not as a result of the United Nations resolutions designating them as peacekeeping troops. They have been there since the end of the Korean war.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I think he is quibbling about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin.

Mr. LANTOS. I am not quibbling at all.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would like him to explain that to the 40 people killed in Somalia that they were not part of the peacekeeping effort in Somalia.

Mr. LANTOS. Those are the facts.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would like to tell him to tell that to the families of the people that were killed. Beyond that, they are losing their lives with some unfortunate degree of regularity. They are peacekeepers. And we are asking to be reimbursed for their efforts.

Mr. LANTOS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman clearly understands the difference between NATO forces which have been in Europe for two generations and United Nations designated peacekeeping forces wherever they are, in Macedonia, which are there as a result of United Nations resolutions designated as peacekeeping forces. By definition, all American forces are designed to keep the peace. We know what the distinction is.

The 80,000 U.N. peacekeepers have 1 percent U.S. participation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out in response to the comment by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] that this amendment does not apply to operations like Desert Storm. The amendment extends only to DOD costs related to peacekeeping operations.

Desert Storm was a war, not a peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace-enforcing, or similar operation. Desert Storm-type operations in the future are exempted from this amendment by the very definition in the section.

I further submit that I recognize that not everyone in this Chamber agrees with the approach that we are suggesting of an in-kind credit proposed by the amendment, but to those who object to that approach, I think it is only fair to ask: What is the alternative solution? How do you propose to pay off the \$1 billion peacekeeping arrearages we will have at the end of this fiscal year? And how shall we pay off the \$1.8 billion arrearages we may have at the end of next year?

So before you reject this amendment's approach, make certain that you have an alternative for finding the money for paying the growing U.N. peacekeeping assessment.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Calling a tail a leg does not make it one. Definition: United Nations peacekeeping activities means any international peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace-enforcing, or similar activity authorized by the U.N. Security Council under chapter 6 or chapter 7 of the U.N. Charter. Desert Storm and Desert Shield were both authorized activities under the U.N. Charter, under chapter 7.

This absolutely does not exclude Desert Storm. If Desert Storm applied when this was in effect, no money would be paid for the next 25 years.

Mr. GILMAN. Reclaiming my time, even though Desert Storm was authorized by the Security Council under chapter 7, that does not necessarily make it peacemaking or peacekeeping.

Mr. BERMAN. What was it? It was not knitting.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] to conclude his comments.

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

Desert Storm was a chapter 7 U.N. operation for peacemaking. It was covered by this. You can say it all you want that it is not covered, Desert Storm was not covered. I understand why you have to say it was not covered, because if Desert Storm is covered, it shows what this resolution does. It prohibits any U.N. dollars for any international peacekeeping operation for the next 25 years. You have to support that, so you have to say it is excluded. Well, it is not.

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman will yield, the Desert Storm operation we all know was a hostile war.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the subcommittee for 13 years that handles the funding for the U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations, I want to lay out some unvarnished facts here.

We have both voluntary and assessed contributions. We are talking about the assessed contributions.

They are established as a result of a treaty, and these assessments are the law of the land. They are owed until the treaty is changed.

About 10 years or so ago, there were only a few peacekeeping operations for which we were making assessed contributions. One of those was \$18 million for the U.N. Interim Force in Lebanon [UNIFIL]. But then the United Nations with our vote and support, voted to establish peacekeeping forces for many world problems. Then, they would say, "Well, we have solved that."

The last 4 or 5 years our subcommittee has been demanding that the U.N. establish criteria and that they not vote for all of these peacekeeping operations every time a problem came up. We were the ones that, in our subcommittee, tried to do something about this. These criteria were not established until the last month. These criteria mean that the United States will not support new peacekeeping operations unless certain requirements are met.

After Ambassador Albright took office a year ago last January, I went up to the United Nations. I spent a day or two up there, and I know that she wants to do something about reducing U.S. assessments. She came to my office. She came to our subcommittee hearing, and she has indicated she wants to do something about negotiating a better deal that we have now.

Secretary General Boutros-Ghali came to my office. He started telling me about how wonderful these peacekeeping operations are. I explained to him that he did not need to go through that process. The facts were we did not have the money and were not going to have the money and were not going to contribute the amount of money that he wanted for peacekeeping operations. When he left, I think he understood better what the situation is.

We then did not appropriate all of the requests for the U.S. assessed contributions, so we would get some leverage. The arrearages will amount to \$1.2 billion by the end of fiscal year 1994 and we have the leverage so that we can negotiate the kind of a deal we need.

I was one of those who suggested we get credit for the expenses that our troops incur in participating in peacekeeping operations, and I think it was the right thing to do. But I never did think that you could completely offset the U.S. assessment. After all, if we completely offset our assessment, it would be extremely difficult to maintain these peacekeeping operations. But it is the right approach to take in our negotiations.

We generally do not provide U.S. troops for a good reason. Troops from the Third World countries are generally more politically acceptable than troop provided from the major world countries. But the troops that are provided for peacekeeping operations have got to be paid. It is in our interest to curtail any new peacekeeping operations to make sure they meet the new criteria, but it is not in our interest to make it impossible to have any more peacekeeping operations.

That is what this amendment would do.

For example, the gentleman from California mentioned U.N. peacekeeping operations in Georgia. In Georgia, if we do not have U.N. peacekeeping forces, the Russians will furnish all the troops, and we do not want the Rus-

sians to have all the troops in Georgia. It is better to have a U.N. presence there than to have the Russians have all the troops in Georgia. So this amendment, I say to you, has some appeal probably with some people. But it is too severe. You cannot say you will not have any more peacekeeping operations until or unless you are going to get all the credit for all the expenses that we may have. It is too severe, and I think we ought to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am completely amazed at how my friends on the other side of the aisle can take a logical proposition and turn it on its head. I hear this amendment described as shutting down U.N. peacekeeping operations. For those who make such claims, I urge you to read the amendment.

I would like to read part of the amendment at this time:

Funds may be obligated or expended for payment to the United Nations of the United States assessed share of peacekeeping operations for that fiscal year only to the extent that such assessed share exceeds the total amount identified, reduced by the amount of any reimbursement or credit to the United States by the United Nations for the costs of the United States' support for, or participation in, U.N. peacekeeping activities.

□ 2030

That is all it says. Right now this country pays approximately 33 percent of the cost of U.N. peacekeeping operations.

I do not know what my colleagues hear from people back home, but where I come from people think we are already paying too much. Yet in addition to this 33 percent assessment, we are also paying the additional unreimbursable cost accrued by the Department of Defense in support of these operations.

In Bosnia, we are paying one-third, approximately, of all the costs of all the troops from Great Britain, from France, from all of the other nations who have personnel on the ground. In addition, however, we are paying all the costs of our ships and sailors and airman in the Adriatic flying support of the rescue operation.

We ought to deduct all those expenses from the one-third assessment that the United Nations asks us to pay—that is all the amendment says. All the rest of the rhetoric we are hearing is simply a smokescreen.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. PENNY].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require the United States to make a dangerous choice:

Either cease all military actions in support of United Nations Security Council resolutions, including: defending South Korea; enforcing the no-fly zone and NATO ultimata in Bosnia; enforcing sanctions against Serbia, Haiti and Iraq; and supporting Operation Provide Comfort in North Iraq and Southern Watch in southern Iraq.

Or force the shut-down of all existing U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Either way, important U.S. interests in the Middle East, Europe, Latin America and Asia would be left undefended.

This amendment would require us to deduct from our U.N. peacekeeping assessment any nonreimbursed expenses incurred by the Department of Defense directly or indirectly in support of U.N. peacekeeping operations.

The premise of the amendment is obviously attractive and seems fair. But in fact, it could have unintended consequences seriously harmful to our national interests.

The United States in fact is reimbursed for most of our direct DOD expenses on behalf of peacekeeping activities. The United States does perform other activities related to U.N. peacekeeping because they are in our national interest, not simply as a favor to the United Nations.

Our current approach to these issues has been supported by administrations both Democratic and Republican, for many, many years. This amendment has tremendous political appeal, but it flies in the face of years of tradition. It undercuts the authority of the United Nations at a time in our history when we need a stronger, not a weaker, voice for international stability and cooperation. The United States is free to decide always on a case-by-case basis when to participate and when to refrain from participation in U.N. peacekeeping operations. Our commitment to both the United Nations and to various peacekeeping efforts is essential in this post-cold war era.

I strongly urge rejection of the Gingrich amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WELDON].

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

Let us set the record straight: This issue is not about pulling out of the United Nations, this issue is not about undermining President Clinton; this issue relates back to what was debated on this House floor last week. It is called burden sharing. Remember what we heard in this body? The allies need to pay their fair share. No more free lunches, no more free rides. Let me read some of the quotes from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 19 which I have in front of me, Mr. Chairman.

Let me read a few quotes. The majority whip said, and I quote:

Mr. Chairman, there was once a time when America needed to foot the bill to defend our allies.

He went on to say:

With this amendment, we are saying it is time for our European allies to pay their fair share too. It is not like they cannot afford it, Mr. Chairman.

Another speaker said, in terms of the amendment we were debating last week, "It is called responsibility-sharing. That is fine with me. I do not care. The politically correct thing now is responsibility-sharing. We need to have our allies pay their fair share."

Another of our colleagues spoke on the floor. As a matter of fact, she spoke on the floor tonight. And what did she say last week? "I want to tell you how my constituents respond when asked the question, 'Should our allies bear more of the costs of their defense?' They respond with an overwhelming 'yes'." She goes on to talk about asking Europeans to pay their fair share when they say they cannot afford it. Mr. Chairman, that is what we are doing. We are saying, when we commit to a United Nations operation, why cannot all of the allies—the Europeans, the Japanese, the French, the Germans—why can they not pay part of the bill?

Mr. Chairman, this is burden-sharing; this is burden-sharing at its best.

One of our other colleagues got up on the House floor and he said, "We are subsidizing to the tune of billions of dollars the economies of our European allies by letting them off the hook when it comes to paying their fair share. And that is all we are talking about, paying their fair share for their own defense."

Another of our colleagues got up and made the same point.

Mr. Chairman, I could go through the entire CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that debate. The facts are very simple: We need to have our allies, through the United Nations, reimburse us for the costs that we bear in sending our troops for missions overseas. That is all that this amendment does. It does not undermine the United Nations, it does not undermine our role, and it does not say that we are not going to support this President when he commits our troops to a U.N. operation. It says one simple thing: Give us credit for our costs and help in the form of our allies paying for the costs associated with this and not have us bear the costs alone.

I think we should support this amendment. It is common sense. It is burden-sharing at its best.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] has expired. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has 1 minute remaining to close the debate.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman is entitled to strike the requisite number of words and is now rec-

ognized for 5 minutes in addition to the 1 minute remaining, for a total of 6 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we come to the close of the debate. My first observation would be, as you listen very carefully to this debate, it is a classic example of why significant policy with such extraordinary implications should not be offered on the floor and debated on the floor when you have not had adequate time in the context of committee proceedings to deliberate carefully. None of us knows the awesome implications of this amendment. This is not the place to simply offer an amendment without having laid the prefatory base for this amendment.

Having made that observation, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Gingrich amendment because I believe this is bad foreign policy, from whatever vantage point one views it.

□ 2040

The amendment would unilaterally change the mechanism by which U.S. assessments for U.N. peacekeeping operations are determined and paid. It would limit our U.N. peacekeeping contributions in a fashion that would do damage, in this gentleman's opinion, to our overall foreign policy and, Mr. Chairman, to national security interests.

This amendment may appeal to some because it appears to hit hard at the United Nations. I would suggest that this amendment is rather anti-United States rather than anti-United Nations. It strikes at the heart of American interests in preventing wars from erupting and expanding.

First, let us be clear on what this amendment does. It says:

Total up everything we spend on military operations that are endorsed by the United Nations, including those that we undertake on our own outside any United Nations administrative framework; then unilaterally recalculate the U.S. assessment for U.N.-conducted peacekeeping by subtracting from this assessment the total of our own expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, several points:

First, again this is bad foreign policy. It unilaterally revises our international obligations; in this case to the United Nations, without any attempt at negotiating first if we have any valid concerns.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the administration is working to reduce our share of U.N. peacekeeping assessments to 25 percent from around 30 to 31 percent. Let us allow the diplomats to do their job.

Third, Mr. Chairman, the Gingrich amendment would hinder attempts of future administrations to turn to the United Nations for involvement and sanction when our Government determines that we should undertake oper-

ations in support of international peacekeeping or humanitarian needs, as George Bush did in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Why would the United Nations give us cover for such operations if doing so would automatically reduce our required contribution to the U.N. budget?

Next point: In this post-cold-war world, we need the United Nations to have more peacekeeping capacity, Mr. Chairman, not less. By reducing the predictability of the American commitment, this would place a large boulder in the path to a stronger U.N. peacekeeping capacity. Do we want our only option in the next Rwanda to be to commit U.S. forces? Or, as the administration suggests, do we want to build a stronger mechanism where international forces, generally without U.S. ground force participation, can be sent to resolve humanity's worst nightmares?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, more generally, if we start unilaterally picking and choosing which of our international obligations to accept, why should other countries not do the same? Why should other countries not decide not to be bound by their U.N. obligations, and proceed to sell nuclear technologies to Saddam Hussein if they so desire? We must build a world of law and of predictable international relations. This amendment would be a giant step backward.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, are in opposition to this amendment, and I would think that any reasonable person in these Chambers would want to oppose this amendment.

The implications of this amendment are far-reaching. As a matter of fact, I tried to talk the authors of this amendment out of offering this amendment, allowing the gentleman from South Carolina and this gentleman to raise this issue in the context of the Committee on Armed Services, allow the Committee on Foreign Affairs to address this issue, let us deliberate substantively on a clear matter that has such extraordinary foreign policy implications that it should be not at the eleventh hour in an amendment drawn on the floor of Congress, ill-conceived, ill-advised, misdirected and inappropriate.

With those observations, Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by asking my colleagues to solidly reject this amendment, and let us go forward with reason and sanity.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, all time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 221, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

AYES—191

Allard	Gillmor	Moorhead
Andrews (NJ)	Gilman	Myers
Applegate	Gingrich	Nussle
Archer	Goodlatte	Orton
Armye	Goodling	Oxley
Bachus (AL)	Goss	Packard
Baker (CA)	Grams	Paxon
Baker (LA)	Green	Petri
Ballenger	Greenwood	Pombo
Barcia	Gunderson	Portman
Barrett (NE)	Hall (TX)	Poshard
Bartlett	Hancock	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hansen	Quillen
Bateman	Hastert	Quinn
Bentley	Hayes	Ramstad
Bereuter	Hefley	Ravenel
Bilbray	Herger	Regula
Bilirakis	Hobson	Ridge
Bliley	Hoekstra	Roberts
Blute	Hoke	Rogers
Boehlert	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Huffington	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonilla	Hunter	Roth
Bunning	Hutchinson	Royce
Burton	Hyde	Sangmeister
Buyer	Inglis	Saxton
Callahan	Inhofe	Schaefer
Calvert	Istook	Schiff
Camp	Jacobs	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Castle	Kasich	Shays
Chapman	Kim	Shuster
Clinger	King	Skeen
Coble	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Condit	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Cooper	Kyl	Snowe
Cox	Lambert	Solomon
Crane	Lazio	Spence
Crapo	Levy	Stearns
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Stenholm
Deal	Lightfoot	Stump
DeFazio	Linder	Sundquist
DeLay	Lipinski	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Tauzin
Dickey	Lucas	Taylor (MS)
Doolittle	Machtley	Taylor (NC)
Dornan	Maloney	Thomas (CA)
Dreier	Manzullo	Thomas (WY)
Duncan	Mazzoli	Torkildsen
Dunn	McCandless	Torricelli
Ehlers	McCollum	Trafficant
Emerson	McCrery	Upton
Everett	McDade	Volkmer
Ewing	McHale	Vucanovich
Fawell	McHugh	Walker
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Walsh
Fowler	McKeon	Weldon
Franks (CT)	McMillan	Young (AK)
Franks (NJ)	Meyers	Young (FL)
Galleghy	Mica	Zeliff
Gallo	Miller (FL)	Zimmer
Gekas	Molinari	

NOES—221

Abercrombie	Browder	Coyne
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Andrews (ME)	Brown (OH)	Danner
Andrews (TX)	Bryant	Darden
Bacchus (FL)	Byrne	de la Garza
Baesler	Cantwell	DeLauro
Barca	Cardin	Dellums
Becerra	Carr	Derrick
Beilenson	Clay	Deutsch
Berman	Clayton	Dicks
Bevill	Clement	Dingell
Bishop	Clyburn	Dixon
Blackwell	Coleman	Dooley
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Durbin
Borski	Collins (MI)	Edwards (CA)
Brewster	Coppersmith	Edwards (TX)
Brooks	Costello	Engel

English	Lehman	Roemer
Eshoo	Levin	Romero-Barcelo
Evans	Lewis (GA)	(PR)
Farr	Long	Rose
Fazio	Lowey	Rostenkowski
Fields (LA)	Mann	Roukema
Filner	Manton	Royland
Fingerhut	Margolies-	Roybal-Allard
Flake	Mezvinsky	Rush
Foglietta	Markey	Sabo
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Sanders
Frost	Matsui	Sarpalius
Furse	McCloskey	Sawyer
Gejdenson	McCurdy	Schenk
Gephardt	McDermott	Schroeder
Geren	McKinney	Schumer
Gilchrest	McNulty	Scott
Glickman	Meehan	Serrano
Gonzalez	Meek	Shepherd
Gordon	Menendez	Sisisky
Gutierrez	Mfume	Skaggs
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Hamburg	Mineta	Slattery
Hamilton	Minge	Slaughter
Harman	Mink	Smith (IA)
Hastings	Moakley	Spratt
Hefner	Mollohan	Stokes
Hilliard	Montgomery	Strickland
Hinchey	Moran	Studds
Hoagland	Morella	Stupak
Hochbrueckner	Murphy	Sweet
Holden	Murtha	Swift
Hoyer	Nadler	Synar
Hughes	Neal (MA)	Tanner
Hutto	Neal (NC)	Tejeda
Insole	Norton (DC)	Thompson
Jefferson	Oberstar	Thornton
Johnson (CT)	Obey	Thurman
Johnson (GA)	Oliver	Torres
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Towns
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Tucker
Johnston	Parker	Unsoeld
Kanjorski	Pastor	Velazquez
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)	Vento
Kennedy	Payne (VA)	Visclosky
Kennelly	Pelosi	Waters
Kildee	Penny	Watt
Klecicka	Peterson (FL)	Waxman
Klein	Peterson (MN)	Wheat
Klink	Pickett	Williams
Kopetski	Pomeroy	Wilson
Kreidler	Porter	Wise
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Lancaster	Rahall	Wyden
Lantos	Rangel	Wynn
LaRocco	Reed	Yates
Laughlin	Reynolds	
Leach	Richardson	

NOT VOTING—26

Barlow	Ford (MI)	Pickle
Barrett (WI)	Ford (TN)	Santorum
Boucher	Gibbons	Sharp
Brown (CA)	Grandy	Stark
Conyers	Horn	Underwood (GU)
de Lugo (VI)	Lewis (FL)	Valentine
Faleomavaega	Lloyd	Washington
(AS)	Michel	Whitten
Fish	Ortiz	Wolf

□ 2103

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to discuss two important provisions of H.R. 4301. The first provision is the military pay raise. The second provision concerns the cost of living adjustments [COLA] for military retirees.

On the subject of the military pay raise, I am pleased with the committee's action. This year, the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, rejected the President's requested 1.6 percent pay raise and approved the full 2.6 percent pay raise which is due to our service men and women. This initiative by the committee corrected the shortcomings in the President's pay proposal. I note that this provision mirrors the proposal in the fiscal

year 1995 Republican budget, written by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Military is the best-trained, best-equipped fighting force in the world. The young men and women who serve in the military must be rewarded for their hard work. These people put their lives on the line every day to protect the security of the United States. It is the duty of Congress to provide them with adequate compensation. More importantly, it is the law. I urge my colleagues to support this provision of the Defense Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to register my strong support for the cost of living adjustments for military retirees. The House Armed Services Committee approved payment of the fiscal year 1995 cost of living adjustments for military retirees on the same schedule as Federal civilian retirees. As a military retiree, I strongly believe in fair pay for current and retired military personnel, and I understand that workers come to rely on their COLA's.

The administration had proposed delaying the COLA for military retirees for several months, in effect, decoupling them from the civilian retirees. This treatment is unfair. Fortunately, H.R. 4301, as reported corrects this. The bill before us ensures that military retirees will get their COLA on time. This provision has my strong support.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop targeting military personnel and retirees in an attempt to balance the Federal budget. I strongly support both the pay raise provision and the provision that will provide for cost of living increases. Fair pay is the right thing to do, and the time to do it is now.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having assumed the chair, Mr. DURBIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4301) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from proceedings of the House on Tuesday, May 24 owing to the death of my mother.

Had I been here, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall vote No. 193, "aye"; rollcall vote No. 194, "nay"; rollcall vote No. 195, "aye"; rollcall vote No. 196, "aye"; rollcall vote No. 197, "nay"; and rollcall vote No. 198, "nay".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was absent Tuesday May 24, 1994. Altogether, I was not present for rollcall votes 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, and 198.

On May 24, I would have voted "yes" on the final passage of H.R. 4453, the Military Construction Appropriations Act, rollcall 193; "no" to the Hansen amendment to H.R. 4301, the Defense Authorization Act, rollcall 194; "yes" to the Harman amendment to H.R. 4301, rollcall 195; "yes" to the Dellums amendment to H.R. 4301, rollcall 196; "no" to the Goss amendment to H.R. 4301, rollcall 197; and "no" to the Spence amendment to H.R. 4301, rollcall 198.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the actions taken today on the bill, H.R. 4301.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, Washington, DC, May 17, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, I am transmitting herewith the resolutions (originals plus one copy) approved today by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Sincerely,
NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Chair, Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

NOTICE OF INTRODUCTION OF PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION REGARDING INVESTIGATION OF HOUSE POST OFFICE

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule IX of the rules of the House, I wish to give formal notice of calling up House Resolution 436 as a privileged resolution.

This rule specifies that the Speaker within 2 legislative days, shall schedule the matter, and I ask that the Speaker coordinate with my office in that scheduling to occur within 2 legislative days.

Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. ROBERTS have joined with me in sponsoring this resolution.

Essentially, this resolution instructs the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to immediately investigate

any alleged violation, by any Member, officer, or employee of the House, of the Code of Official Conduct or of any law, rule, regulation pursuant to the House Post Office, and shall report to the House and to the public, its findings not later than September 30, 1994.

According to the rule, the Speaker has 2 legislative days to fix a time that he considers proper for the House to consider this matter. I will cooperate with the Speaker to choose a mutually convenient time within that period for the House to consider this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the form of this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point as though read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 436

Whereas allegations reported in public and made in official Department of Justice court documents that personnel of the House Post Office provided illegal cash to certain Members in three ways: (1) cash instead of stamps for official vouchers, (2) cash for postage stamps which had earlier been purchased with official vouchers, and (3) cash for campaign checks;

Whereas the Department of Justice has secured admissions of criminal guilt regarding past activities in the House Post Office;

Whereas multiple concerns and allegations of possible wrongdoing by House employees, a House officer, and Members had been raised within the report of the House Administration Committee Task Force to Investigate the Operation and Management of the House Post Office;

Whereas all these allegations directly affect the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings, and the rights, reputation, and conduct of its Members;

Whereas Article I, Section 5, of the Constitution gives each House of Congress responsibility over disorderly behavior of its Members; and

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has jurisdiction over the conduct and behavior of current House Members, officers, and employees, including investigatory authority, and is the appropriate body of this House to conduct any inquiry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is instructed to immediately investigate any alleged violation, by any Member, officer, or employee of the House, of the Code of Official Conduct or of any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct that is related to activities, described by or referred to in, documents that it received on July 22, 1992, from the Committee on House Administration pertaining to the House Administration Committee Task Force to Investigate the Operation and Management of the House Post Office investigation. Not later than 60 days after this resolution is agreed to and periodically thereafter, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House the status of this investigation. Not later than September 30, 1994, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall report to the House its findings of fact and rec-

ommendations on possible disciplinary actions.

□ 2110

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DRIFT AND DISORDER IN THE CLINTON FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, during this Member's service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have sought to operate in a bipartisan manner. This Member has always adhered to the old adage that politics should stop at the water's edge. On many issues, from South Africa to Chile to China, this Member worked with his colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in order to forge a consensus policy. Therefore, this Member rises to voice his concerns about the Clinton administration's foreign policy with great reluctance and only after considerable thought.

But this Member cannot, and this House should not, remain silent in the face of the increasingly troublesome drift in American foreign policy; a drift that, if allowed to continue, will have a devastating effect on international stability, the world economy, and the influence and well-being of the United States. It is this Member's fear, for example, that the administration's indecision and uncertainty on the proper role of military force in U.S. foreign policy is undermining the U.S. status as leader of the free world. Moreover, this lack of understanding of how and when to use military force is actually increasing the likelihood that we will become engaged in a conflict.

Mr. Speaker, the American public elected a President who clearly identified domestic policy and especially the economy as the primary focus of his administration. Repeating the slogan "It's the economy, stupid!", candidate Bill Clinton never hid his apparent disdain for the importance of foreign policy and defense and security matters.

But, while a presidential candidate may cavalierly ignore foreign policy matters or take positions of political convenience on such matter, the leader of the free world does not have that luxury. The President of the United States is the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of the world's greatest democracy and most powerful nation. As such, he cannot be disengaged from the world scene. The President

cannot get involved only when it suits him. The President must learn that a coherent policy cannot be achieved by postponing decisions until an international crisis has spun out of control. The President must learn that achieving a coherent U.S. foreign policy is sometimes difficult and always important.

As Karen Elliot House noted in the May 4, 1994, edition Wall Street Journal, "the paradox of Mr. Clinton is that he is smart enough to understand that America is inextricably linked to trends and event beyond its borders; so far, however, he hasn't been wise enough to recognize his rhetoric must have some connection to reality." The President or his key policy spokespersons cannot, for example, repeatedly threaten air strikes, or invasions, or other military operations without undermining the credibility of the United States and reducing the effectiveness of those options and reducing available options.

The inevitable result is that we have come to the position where rogue regimes and international outlaws are concluding that America neither says what it means nor means what it says—and that there seems to be little, if any, penalty for challenging the international order. Let me offer just a few examples.

In the case of North Korea's blatant efforts to achieve a highly destabilizing nuclear capability, President Clinton announced, absolutely and unequivocally, that America would not tolerate even one North Korean nuclear device. However, North Korea has continued to defy both the United States and the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA], and it has subsequently been revealed that Pyongyang already possessed sufficient fissile material to build several bombs. The U.S. response—which has vacillated between shrill denunciations and threats of reprisals, and muted offers of concessions if North Korea would return to the negotiating table—has severely undermined our leadership on this volatile issue. Not surprisingly, our friends and allies in the region look at the U.S. response with considerable skepticism.

This Member would also point to the matter of the arms embargo for Bosnia. Over the past year, the administration has repeatedly suggested to our allies that the embargo to be lifted and the Bosnian Moslems be allowed to arm themselves. Our allies have unanimously rejected this proposal. I raise this concern because this body will, after we return after the Memorial Day district work period, vote on an amendment to the Defense authorization that would lift the arms embargo. And, Mr. Speaker, the administration—which for over a year has publicly supported the lifting of the embargo—has now pulled out all stops to defeat the amendment.

It seems that the administration has second thoughts now that the legislative branch wants to encourage action instead of empty rhetoric.

The ongoing crisis in Haiti is equally alarming. President Clinton has repeatedly threatened to use force to return Mr. Aristide to power. Yet the junta that rules in Port-au-Prince no longer takes these threats seriously. As a result, the administration has been reduced to tightening an embargo that primarily punishes the poor and suffering masses. The administration's treatment of the asylum issues has been equally erratic, and has been driven in large part by wholly inappropriate domestic political considerations. The perception is that the administration had allowed our asylum policy to be dictated by Randall Robinson's fasting, and this must not be allowed to happen. The net result is that the military junta remains firmly in control of Haiti, and a tide of refugees has once again taken to the water and to building boats in an attempt to escape the deprivation that our embargo is accentuating. Equally disturbing, the Clinton administration's policy failure with regard to Haiti seems to have provided a ready-made excuse for intervening to restore President Aristide, an effort that clearly would be inappropriate.

Mr. Speaker, these and other fiascos have resulted in a startling decline in international credibility for the United States. Our adversaries, the rogue regimes and potential aggressor nations of the world, are encouraged by every new misstep.

ELECTORAL REFORM IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during the debate over NAFTA, important questions were raised about the relationship between free trade and issues of democracy and human rights. Congress was told time and time again that with the promotion of free trade there would be a corresponding impetus toward true democracy in Mexico. I wish that I could report that there is a light at the end of a very long and dark tunnel for the Mexican people.

Mexico's ruling revolutionary institutional party has maintained power since 1929. It continues to maintain exclusive control over Mexico's electoral apparatus, including voter registration lists and processes, vote tabulation systems, and all bodies responsible for election oversight, review, and certification.

The PRI, as its known in Mexico, has shown little inclination towards giving up power. They have selected their candidate for the upcoming presidential elections as they always have. The

process was more a coronation than any pretense towards democracy. Now, the PRI is going about the business of making sure their anointed candidate wins the election. Again, as in the past, there is little that the PRI will not do to make sure that happens.

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States has found Mexico in violation of Article 23 of the American Convention on Human Rights, which requires the holding of genuine elections that guarantee the free expression of the will of the voters.

The Salinas government talks of the need for political reform. Yet, the PRI, the party which Mr. Salinas is the head of, systematically has used fraud and intimidation in many of the local elections leading up to the presidential election this August. Electoral irregularities and fraud were widely reported during elections held in the State of Yucatan in December 1993, including voter turnout rates that approached or exceeded 100 percent in at least 20 voting districts and a statewide electrical power failure as ballots were being counted. Specific instances of electoral fraud were also widely reported during elections held in the State of Morelos in March 1994, including massive manipulation of the electoral registry.

In the course of the current political campaign, the vicious cycle of political violence and corruption in Mexico has already claimed the lives in the PRI's first presidential candidate, Luis Donaldo Colosio, and subsequently, the police chief of Tijuana who was investigating the case. Mr. Colosio, who was a reformist while president of the PRI in the late 1980's, was considered to be the candidate with the strongest inclination toward political change.

Police Chief Jose Frederico Benitez Lopez had simply raised doubts about the Mexican government's account of the political assassination.

While the Mexican government has been making promises for electoral reform to the United States Government for the past couple of years, mainly in order to get NAFTA passed, the Mexican people have heard these same promises for decades. Years and years of broken promises have piled up. Is it any wonder that the Mexican people doubt their own leaders when they talk of reform? Is it any wonder that the Mexican people have begun to take matters in their own hands?

Is it any wonder that there was an uprising in Chiapas? In alarm, the Mexican government has tried to placate the people in Chiapas with food and offers of land. Mr. Salinas tried to calm the situation by offering a pardon to their leader, Subcomandante Marcos. But like Marcos, the Mexican people have rejected these offers. Like Marcos, the Mexican people have rejected these offers. Like Marcos, the

Mexican people are no longer interested in more pardons and paternalism.

The Mexican people are a proud nation. Yet, the Mexican Government acts as if they were bestowing a gift to the people when speaking of electoral reform. In return for the mere talk of reform, gratitude—and silence—is expected.

People from all over Mexico, like Marcos, are beginning to ask: what do the Mexican people have to be grateful for? Of not dying of hunger? Of living in one of the slums along the border? Of having to fight for what they believe in? For the basic rights of liberty, justice and democracy that any free people are entitled to?

And to whom exactly should they be grateful to? To those Mexican elites who for years and years have kept them down? To the U.S. corporations who give the Mexican people a couple of dollars for a hard day's work? To the Mexican Government for promising everything under the Sun but delivering nothing? To the U.S. Government for signing NAFTA?

There is a price to pay for ignoring a people's longstanding calls for true democracy and justice as illustrated by the rebellion in Mexico's poorest State, Chiapas. The rebellion should serve as a reminder to those who set policies and priorities in Mexico—and here in the United States as well—that a people wanting change will be ignored for only so long.

This year Mexico is facing one of the most pivotal national elections in its history. Mexico now has before it both the opportunity and the challenge to achieve desperately needed political and social reforms.

We, in the United States, have a solemn duty to support this process of reform in Mexico. It is not enough to simply enrich big business and the Mexican elites through trade agreements like NAFTA. It is our duty to see that all people, both Mexican and American, are truly free and prosperous. The way the upcoming elections in Mexico are conducted will say much about whether that country is on the road to true democracy or not.

□ 2120

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 24, INDEPENDENT COUNSEL REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (H. Rept. No. 103-527) on the resolution (H. Res. 439) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 24) to reauthorize the independent counsel law for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4385, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-528) on the resolution (H. Res. 440) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4385) to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the National Highway System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A CERTAIN REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4426, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-529) on the resolution (H. Res. 441) waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of a certain resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, which was reported to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HEALTH CARE REFORM VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the votes on health care reform which took place in the Labor-Management Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor on May 24, 1994:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

HEALTH CARE MARK-UP, MAY 24, 1994

The following recorded votes were taken on May 24, 1994 in the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Education and Labor during consideration of Chairman Williams' substitute proposal for H.R. 3600, the Health Security Act of 1994:

1. An amendment by Mr. Fawell to provide uniform remedies under the Chairman's mark by striking the punitive and actual damages (including compensatory and consequential damages) available in cases involving claims disputes. The amendment was rejected 10-17.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Williams, "nay."
Mr. Ford (ex officio), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Clay, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Kildee, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Miller (CA), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Owens, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Martinez, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Payne, "nay."
Mrs. Unsoeld, "nay."
Mrs. Mink, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Klink, "nay."
Mr. Murphy, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Engel, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Becerra, "nay."

Mr. Green, "nay" by proxy.
Ms. Woolsey, "nay."
Mr. Romero-Barceló, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mrs. Roukema, "yea."
Mr. Goodling (ex officio), "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Gunderson, "yea."
Mr. Arney, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Barrett, "yea."
Mr. Boehner, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Fawell, "yea."
Mr. Ballenger, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Hoekstra, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. McKeon, "yea."

2. An amendment by Mr. Fawell to restore in several respects the type of federal uniformity that is currently served by ERISA preemption which is eliminated by certain provisions under H.R. 3600 as contained in the Chairman's mark. In particular, this amendment would (1) eliminate the provision which would allow states to require benefits in excess of the comprehensive benefit package for corporate and regional alliances, (2) eliminate the requirement that fee-for-service plans under corporate alliances use the negotiated fee schedules applicable to regional alliances, (3) preserve current ERISA preemption rules during the transitional insurance reform period, and (4) eliminate the application to corporate alliances of the single-payer state-wide and regional alliance options. Under the Chairman's mark, corporate alliances are redefined as "experience rated plans" and regional alliances are redefined as "consumer purchasing cooperatives" and "community rating areas." The amendment was rejected 10-17.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Williams, "nay."
Mr. Ford (ex officio), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Clay, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Kildee, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Miller (CA), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Owens, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Martinez, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Payne, "nay."
Mrs. Unsoeld, "nay."
Mrs. Mink, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Klink, "nay."
Mr. Murphy, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Engel, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Becerra, "nay."
Mr. Green, "nay."
Ms. Woolsey, "nay."
Mr. Romero-Barceló, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mrs. Roukema, "yea."
Mr. Goodling (ex officio), "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Gunderson, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Arney, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Barrett, "yea."
Mr. Boehner, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Fawell, "yea."
Mr. Ballenger, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Hoekstra, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. McKeon, "yea" by proxy.

3. An amendment to the Williams amendment by Mr. Gunderson to provide employers with more than 50 employees the flexibility to choose between community-rated health plans (i.e. "Regional Alliances") and experience-rated health plans (i.e. "Corporate Alliances"), including self-insured health plans. In addition, the amendment would require the Secretary of Labor to develop an appropriate risk adjustment program for all self-insured employers in the event there is significant adverse risk selection against community-rated health plans. The amendment was rejected 11-17-1.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Williams, "nay."

Mr. Ford (ex officio), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Clay, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Kildee, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Miller (CA), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Owens, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Martinez, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Payne, "nay."
Mrs. Unsoeld, "nay" by proxy.
Mrs. Mink, "nay."
Mr. Klink, "nay."
Mr. Murphy, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Engel, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Becerra, "nay."
Mr. Green, "yea."
Ms. Woolsey, "yea."
Mr. Romero-Barceló, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mrs. Roukema, present/pass.
Mr. Goodling (ex officio), "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Gunderson, "yea."
Mr. Arney, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Barrett, "yea."
Mr. Boehner, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Fawell, "yea."
Mr. Ballenger, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Hoekstra, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. McKeon, "yea" by proxy.

THE TRUTH COMES OUT WITH GATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the old international dispute between Mexico and the United States over the U.S. 1972 Marine Mammal Protection Act which bans the use of tuna nets to catch dolphins has resulted in the European Community jumping into the dispute with charges of their own.

The European Community is the winner and the United States and the dolphins are the losers with a GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] dispute panel ruling the American ban illegal because GATT does not allow trade bans based on production methods. Production method is a fancy name for a net but, it still means that dolphins will be killed.

Mexico originally complained to GATT and won a dispute panel ruling against the United States in 1991. The GATT panel determined that GATT barred any administrative law that attempts to regulate wildlife outside a nation's borders.

Mexico, however, did not push the original GATT ruling according to the Wall Street Journal, because it feared the dispute would spoil Mexico's chances for Congressional approval for a North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA].

Fortunately for the United States, the GATT ruling is just in time for Americans to discover how GATT really works before we vote on the GATT and the World Trade Organization. The claims about the authority of the panels to bring sanctions, or allow the raising of tariffs, plus the secretiveness of the whole process are borne out by our trade negotiators.

Apparently Ambassador Kantor, the U.S. Trade Representative, is unhappy with the ruling. According to the Wall Street Journal, the Ambassador stated, "GATT procedures not only denied us a fair hearing, but they need to be totally revamped". This is in response to the hearing which was held in secret with closed proceedings. Ambassador Kantor's calling for revamping the rules is a little late since his team agreed to these new rules in December.

Coming from the horse country in Maryland, this reminds me of someone closing the barn door after the horse has bolted out of the yard.

The article also pointed out that the current GATT allows a panel ruling to be blocked, but—the new World Trade Organization rulings cannot be vetoed. The paper also pointed out that Ambassador Kantor stated "the U.S. would refuse to alter the Marine Mammal Protection Act."

Advocates of GATT will claim this ruling does not affect our laws, but that is not exactly so under the new World Trade Organization. According to government documents the Dispute mechanism places time limits on when a Member of the WTO must bring its laws into conformity with panel rulings and recommendations.

The mechanism also includes an authorization for retaliation if a Member has not brought its laws into conformity with its obligations to the WTO within a set period of time. Now, that is an interesting statement since the New York Times editorialized that the World Trade Organization bares no fangs in trade dispute cases but can authorize the plaintiff to retaliate.

That means the petitioner has the ability to place tariffs on U.S. products, and it may not be in the offending sector. An example is if orange growers were violating trade law, the GATT panel may allow apple growers to be penalized. Sounds like Russian roulette—all an American business could do is hope the tariff threats would not be pointed at them.

The actual GATT document that explains the dispute settlement agreement of the GATT provides that a losing country should implement the panel's report immediately. If not, the agreement provides for prompt, effective procedures to resolve disputes about the degree of compliance with the report.

It sounds nice that the WTO would lower tariffs, but it may or may not be so. It depends on from what you are lowering them. Canadian authorities planned in January to impose tariffs up to 351 percent on certain basic farm products from the United States. Canada claimed the new GATT gave them the authority for these astronomical tariffs which would be reduced only 15 to 36 percent over a period of years. We need to beware. It seems the Government is claiming one thing while what

the GATT does with the WTO is the one which has the ultimate authority. We must all wise up before it is too late.

RENEWING THE AMERICAN DREAM—WHAT WILL IT TAKE TO MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and May 23, 1994, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the minority leader's designee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I get the sense from reading the papers, from listening to my constituents, and from participating in the legislative process in Congress, that people are quickly approaching a boiling point over the direction and future of the United States.

While unemployment in my State of Michigan reached historic lows according to recent statistics, the information is almost irrelevant to the emotional and psychological disposition of the State.

Somehow, in some way, people understand that the problems facing America today are more than skin deep. They are not going away.

□ 2130

They are part of a national crisis that involves something deep and more significant than the latest economic statistics? People know there is something wrong with our country, and they want us to confront the issues.

So that is what I intend to do here today. I am here to talk about the United States. Personally, I have no president and no political party to defend.

In many ways, we are all to blame. You, me, and every voting age man and woman in this country. Our problems were not completely caused by government, nor will they be completely solved by government. They are deeper than that. And I, for one, am not going to trivialize our Nation's problems by suggesting that some magical welfare reform bill, or crime bill, or health care reform bill, is going to solve our problems.

You see, no civilization can survive with 12 year olds having babies, 15 year olds killing one another, 17 year olds dying of AIDS, and 18 year olds graduating with diplomas they cannot read.

This is not a liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican question; as Americans, we are all faced with the decay of our civilization. And, in our own way, we have contributed to it.

So what must we do? What can we do to reverse this decline and set in motion a vision that will restore hope and renew the American dream?

Let us begin by defining our economic and cultural environment. Our generation has the opportunity and re-

sponsibility to deal with three big facts:

First, the information age—Alvin Toffler's Third Wave of Change—is real and will change our economy, it must change our government, our society, and each of us.

The latest Business Week Magazine describes the Information Revolution and how digital technology is changing the way we live.

This should be required reading for all Federal employees. Just the headlines of the articles are instructive: Faster, Smaller, Cheaper; The Keys of the Future; A Gigabyte on Every Desk; The New Face of Business; The Great Equalizer; Breaking the Chains of Command; and last, but not least, Washington Bogs Down on Booting Up.

The question we must ask ourselves is this: Is a large, bureaucratic government capable of keeping up with what's happening with the Information Revolution? I certainly applaud Vice President GORE's efforts to press forward with the national infrastructure. But while we might be able to facilitate progress in one area, we are increasing the size and scope of government in other areas. We must understand and respond adequately to the Information Revolution. This means keeping government as small as possible, while working with private industry at creating opportunities for all Americans.

The second big fact we must acknowledge is that the world market is real and unescapable, no matter how much we might like to. We can build walls around the United States and create protectionist measures, but all that will do is increase opportunities for our competitors.

Failure to aggressively pursue global market opportunities is harmful to the American people, both as workers and consumers. And since we must be competitive to survive, we will need to be more productive, more innovative and more entrepreneurial than other nations. To do this, America will have to re-think taxation, litigation and regulation in the context of the global marketplace. From education to welfare to the size of the government, every policy has to be reassessed to improve our ability to compete globally.

Finally, we must, as a society, acknowledge that the welfare state has failed. Every night we see the proof of failure on the local TV news.

The welfare state has failed because it is profoundly wrong about human beings.

The welfare state reduces a citizen to a client, subordinates them to a bureaucrat, and subjects them to rules that are anti-work, anti-family, anti-property, and anti-opportunity.

Any group of humans subjected to treatment like this would develop the social pathologies we see in the news.

These three facts establish the framework by which we should assess

the country and world in which we live. This is the current environment. And these three big facts are the way things are, as I see it. I think all the evidence available at this time confirms this.

What must we do?

First, we must replace the welfare state, and the mentality that goes with it. Not improve, not repair, not finance—replace the welfare state.

In a nutshell, we must change the way we think about government and its proper role in American society. Currently, our government is way too big, it spends way too much, and it is choking businesses with paternalistic regulations and excessive taxation. We are mandating workplace cooperation at the expense of entrepreneurship and creativity in labor-management relations. And we are about to debate a health care reform bill that will place a large segment of our health care industry under the control of the Federal Government.

Beyond paternalism, the welfare state fails to motivate human beings by taking away the incentives to work hard and get ahead. This is probably the greatest crime of the modern welfare state. People who are dependent on government welfare are not motivated to seek opportunities. Those who are choking from government regulation and taxation are not motivated to seek new opportunities. Why? Because under the current system, success is taxed and failure is subsidized.

This is the welfare state. Some might call it socialist. I just call it inefficient, outdated, and the road to failure. It fails to recognize the rapid changes of the information age. It fails to accept the challenge of world economic competition, and fails to give American businesses the tools they need to compete.

What will replace the welfare state? If the term "welfare state" implies government policies and programs that stifle economic growth, and limit opportunity and freedom, then we must replace the welfare state with policies and programs that encourage economic growth, opportunity and freedom.

For this reason, we must replace the welfare state with an opportunity society.

While the welfare state emphasizes government, redistribution of the wealth and bureaucratic rules and regulations—leading to a government that is too big and spends too much—the opportunity society is based on a much broader vision of freedom that emphasizes citizens, and the creation of wealth.

The welfare state emphasizes problems.

The opportunity society emphasizes opportunities.

The welfare state emphasizes victimization.

The opportunity society emphasizes personal responsibility.

□ 2140

The welfare state emphasizes Government paternalism. The opportunity society emphasizes empowerment. The welfare state emphasizes the safety net. The opportunity society emphasizes family and community.

The welfare state overemphasizes the role of Government and concentrates too much power and responsibility in Government. The opportunity society emphasizes small but powerful Government that protects private property, promotes free markets, preserves human dignity, and defends American ideals around the world.

I believe that the American people want an opportunity society. This is not Republican or Democrat, conservative or liberal. Instead it is a principle-centered, vision-driven government implementing policies that conform to accepted virtues. Overwhelmingly, Americans favor work replacing welfare, strengthening the family, national initiative and referendum, term limits for Members of Congress, reducing the size of Government, fewer lawsuits. They are against quotas, for a balanced budget, they are for a line item veto and help recognize that small businesses and entrepreneurs are the engine that fuels and runs our economy.

Has Congress passed one bill in the past 17 months that truly highlights any of these policy objectives? I believe the answer is clearly "no," but what have we done if we have been here for 17 months, what have we done during the last 17 months is Congress has increased the size of Government, we passed the biggest tax increase in American history, we have implemented racial quotas in sentencing for important capital crimes, we have expanded the welfare state through billions of dollars in new social programs to improve teenagers' self-esteem. We have rejected the Presidential line item veto. We have heaped more regulations on businesses through mandated family leave laws and other laws, defeated a balanced budget amendment. This is just what damage Congress has already done in the last 17 months. Consider what we are working on: A huge Federal bureaucracy to take control of the health care industry and more increased taxes to pay for it, a welfare reform bill that will actually cost the Federal Government more money, continued dependency and increased taxes to pay for it, new OSHA regulations that could wipe out many small and medium-sized businesses. Government is getting bigger and we are going to continue spending more and when we cannot go back to the American people for more taxes, we will just mandate the regulations on business so our consumers will pay hidden taxes through higher prices on the goods they buy.

So what would legislation look like that would emphasize the principles

and ideals of an opportunity society? I will have a longer list in a few minutes but let me talk about one item that will break the paradigm of how we do business here in Washington. I believe perhaps a first step should be to give all Americans a greater voice in setting the agenda in what we do here in Washington. After 1992, after the elections, the American people thought they had sent a clear message to Washington. But Washington has not gotten it. We just do not get it.

I recognize, after my first 2 or 3 months in Washington that very little was going to change in this Congress, without the active participation of the American people. We can make changes here in Washington, but the American people have to become more involved in the process to let us know what they want us to do. They had used the greatest tools in the November election to help set the agenda for the Congress and the President. Yet Congress has done nothing. What was that tool? It was the election process, but with 110 new Members this Congress looks much like the old Congress that served before the new reform-minded agenda the American people thought they were going to be getting. That is why in April of last year I introduced my first two pieces of legislation calling for a constitutional amendment providing for a national voter initiative process. Those of you from States that like Michigan, allow voter initiative at the State level, understand what an initiative could do. Voters across the Nation would have the opportunity to circulate petitions, to get a law or a constitutional amendment or a proposal to repeal a law on the ballot in all 50 States. A vote would then be held at the next regularly scheduled general election.

This process would give the American people the opportunity to help set the agenda for the Nation.

I have few doubts that if we had the national voter initiative in the United States we would have term limits, we would have a Presidential line-item veto, I believe we would have lower taxes, we would have less regulation, we would have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. These basic reform proposals which seem so simple will not pass this Congress. In fact, Congress will not even debate term limits, it will not even come to the floor for a vote. We must seriously consider a national voter initiative and referendum process so that the American people can have a greater say in the way decisions are made for them in Washington. It is an element of an opportunity society providing the American people with an opportunity to reclaim a hold on this institution in what we do here, for them to take back Government. What are other major items that are part of an agenda of change that adhere to the principles

that we would find in an opportunity society: Principles of personal strength, individual liberty, and limited government.

Major parts of the agenda are term limits for Members of Congress, we would have people flowing in and out of this institution. A balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We would recognize that deficit spending is robbing from future generations and is unfair to them. We would have a welfare reform bill that especially emphasized work, it would emphasize strengthening the family and increasing the role of private enterprise. We would have a reform bill, malpractice and product liability reform, we would have a bill to strengthen families by ending the marriage penalties in the income tax, we would have an earned income tax credit and social security by increasing the deduction for children to the Harry Truman level of approximately, in today's dollars, of \$7,500 per child. We would have an economic growth bill to encourage job creation by small businesses. We would accelerate the rate of development of new technologies and increase American jobs by competing in the world market.

Yes, we would also have a bill to shrink Government, cut spending, downsize the bureaucracy, to cut unfunded mandates and return power to local government, local communities, businesses, charities, and individuals.

We would have a market oriented medical savings account, focused health reform bill to provide universal access for all Americans if none has been passed this year.

Ultimately each of us must decide what our role will be in replacing the welfare state with an opportunity society and renewing the American dream. This is no easy task. It requires that we change our assumptions about what Government can or cannot do. It requires that we establish the basic principles that create the standards by which we judge public policy. When we consider policy changes we must ask whether they meet some basic criteria. Does the policy encourage personal responsibility? Does the policy maintain personal liberty and freedom? Does this policy grow Government or does it shrink it? Does this policy strengthen families? Does this policy support entrepreneurship and free enterprise? Or does this policy make us more secure both physically and financially?

□ 2150

If a policy proposal meets these criteria, chances are it is a good policy. If it does not meet these criteria, it should not be pursued.

We should go through every program, every law, every tax, every regulation in the Federal Government and ask these questions. We should do it for every new law, but perhaps more im-

portantly we should do an audit of all of the bills and the laws that we are currently working under and see whether they meet these criteria. Perhaps this Congress should spend 3 to 4 months doing nothing but auditing previous laws before we pass any new ones to see exactly what kind of environment we have created. What are the results of the laws that we have passed?

Mr. Speaker, maybe, if we do this, we can renew the American dream and return America to its historic greatness.

Recently I had the opportunity to talk more in depth about my initiative and referendum proposal, and I would like to go back to that by restating some of the things that I talked about in another special order a few nights ago. I want to talk about it because it was very interesting. I received calls from around the country telling me that this was a good idea, people asking me how they could be involved in the process to let them reclaim at least a portion of the agenda that we are working on here in Washington.

We talked about the frustration that night that the American people feel with their government and their elected leaders. We talked about the fact that the root of this frustration is the perception that, no matter how many incumbent politicians lose to eager newcomers, the most important issues on the voters' minds are not addressed. We talked about it here on the floor. I talked about it with those people who called my office.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious problem and one which will not go away until this institution recognizes it and takes bold steps to demonstrate to the American people that we not only care about what they think, but that we are willing to take concrete steps, concrete action, to reconnect the voters with the agenda here in Washington.

My legislation, H.R. 3835, would provide for a national referendum on term limits for the November 8 election of this year. However, through the number of phone calls and the input that I have received from people around the country, we are going to expand the agenda for H.R. 3825. Not only now will it be a national referendum on term limits, but we are going to expand it by trying to move for three questions on the November 8 ballot. We are going to talk about congressional reform. We are going to set the agenda here in Washington. Let us really do it, and let us get those issues on the forefront on this national initiative on November 8. Let us ask the question about term limits. Let us ask the question about a balanced budget amendment. And let us talk about the need for a line-item veto.

Mr. Speaker, if I were a constituent of a Member of the House who has not cosponsored H.R. 3835, the National Voice on Term Limits Act, I would probably give him or her a call and ask

that he cosponsor this important piece of legislation. The American people deserve a voice on term limits; and in the expanded version they deserve a voice on a balanced budget amendment, and they deserve a voice on this line-item veto. This body will not even debate the term limit issue. We have debated the balance budget amendment and the line-item veto, but we have not had the resolve to pass them. Perhaps we need to hear more clearly from the American people what they want us to do.

Mr. Speaker, in over 200 years Congress has held only 2 to 3 hours of hearings on term limits. It is high time Congress takes action on term limits and that it provides the American people with a way to send a clear signal to us on the balanced budget amendment and on a line-item veto. My bill, H.R. 3835, the national referendum on term limits, and now the balanced budget and the line-item veto, would place these issues on the ballot on November 8, not of 1996, but of this year. We can pass it this year if the American people will call their Congress people to tell them to take a look and to tell them and to tell all of us that they want a voice on setting the agenda here in Washington.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the American people in 5½ months would have the opportunity to vote on these issues and send a clear signal to every Member of Congress what they wanted. But perhaps more importantly, between now and November 8, we would move that debate to the national forefront.

Why is that important? I believe the American people have the opportunity and need the opportunity to hear a full debate on the balanced budget and the line-item veto. We have debated it here in this House, but let us take it to the people and provide them with the opportunity.

But let us take a look at term limits. What has happened with term limits? Three hours of debate in a committee hearing in 1994.

Where else have term limits been debated? Mr. Speaker, you have debated them in the courts because they have been challenged in those States where the people have spoken and want term limits. So, the debate is being held in the courts, not in Congress, not in front of the American people, but in some small courtroom in Washington and in Arkansas. Let us take the debate where it should be, and that is in front of the American people.

Yes, that is what H.R. 3835, the national referendum on these issues, would do. Every American would have the opportunity to listen to the debate, to participate in the debate and then have this opportunity to vote on November 8 as they elect the next Congress.

I say, "When you go to vote for the candidate of your choice on November

8, you'll also then be given the opportunity to vote yes or no on these issues."

Mr. Speaker, what a great opportunity for the American people to express their views on these issues to their government. But, more importantly, what a powerful and new way to reconnect Congress and the American people just when we need it most, just when we now recognize that our popularity, and I do not care about popularity, but when 80 percent of the people believe that Congress is doing a poor job, it is time for us to reconnect with the American people and provide them with the opportunity to influence us so that, when we come back in January 1995, we can respond to the national referendum that they have given us, that they will have provided us input on November 8, and we can start 1995 off with a great opportunity to meet and respond to their feedback.

But there is a slight problem, as there always is in Washington. It is funny how that always happens. I introduced my bill in February, and it is still bottled up in the Subcommittee on Elections. I did receive a letter from the chairman of the committee stating that he will not have time for hearings until later this fall. I feel pretty good about that because maybe we will have hearings this fall, but again the small problem is, Mr. Speaker, if he had read the bill, which his staff probably did, they are well aware that I am seeking a national referendum on these issues in November 1994, not 1996 or 1998.

□ 2200

If the Subcommittee on Elections does not have time until this fall, then what they are saying is that they do not have time to consider my bill at all. After all, why would the subcommittee consider a bill in November that calls for a national referendum in November? There is no way we would be able to get it done.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is deliberate stonewalling of this proposal in the House Administration Subcommittee on Elections. It suggests to me that the chairman opposes this national referendum idea and has, therefore, decided that the Subcommittee on Elections does not have the time to talk about it or to act on it. This is a shame. Every poll I have seen in the last few years has public support for term limits at over 75 percent. Yes, 75 to 80 percent of the American people support term limits. The numbers for the balanced budget and line-item veto are similar. But most importantly, this would provide us the opportunity to reconnect.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better, they deserve a voice on their government and what we do. The American people deserve the chance to vote on these issues. Actually, they deserve much more than that. They real-

ly deserve a better, a more effective and a more responsive government.

Mr. Speaker, like I said earlier, if I were a constituent, I would wonder whether my Congressman or my Congresswoman is a cosponsor of H.R. 3835, the National Referendum on Term Limits. The only way the American people will have a chance to vote on term limits or a balanced budget or a line-item veto on November 8 is to call their Congressman or Congresswoman and ask him or her to cosponsor this legislation. Only then will the leadership in this Chamber, including the Speaker of the House, Mr. FOLEY, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Elections, Mr. SWIFT, both from the State of Washington, allow this proposal to be voted on.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should be outraged. How many Americans must support term limits, a balanced budget and a line item veto before Congress will vote on it? Already 80 percent support term limits. Do 90 percent of the American people need to support term limits before the House will vote on it? Ninety-five percent? Ninety-eight percent? At what point in time will Congress take up the issue of term limits and when will we provide the opportunity to the American people to give us feedback on a balanced budget amendment and a line-item veto? When will this Congress be serious about reconnecting with the American people in restoring out trust with them?

Mr. Speaker, if I were at home right now in my living room watching this on C-SPAN, I would be asking whether my Representative was willing to give me a voice on the issue of term limits. I would be asking, what is my Congressperson doing to restore the credibility of Congress? I would pick up my phone, probably tomorrow morning, or I would get out a piece of paper, write a note to my Representative in Congress asking him or her to give me a voice on these issues, to cosponsor 3835, the national referendum on term limits.

If I were a constituent, I would ask my Representative to give me a chance to vote on these issues in a national election on November 8 of this year, just 5½ months from now. I would ask my Representative to try to experiment in democracy, to see whether we can elevate the debate on these issues to such a level that when I went and they went to the polls on November 8, they felt that they really now understood these issues, they felt that they were now prepared to make a decision to instruct their Members of Congress on these issues and, therefore, would go to the polls on November 8 in ever-increasing numbers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems we have today in this country is voter turnout is too low. I think people are checking out. I would hope that

through a 5½-month process of aggressive debate on these issues, people would come back to the polls and they would say, I am going to give it one more shot, I am going to give it two more shots, I am going to give it three shots because I am going to have an opportunity to vote on three issues. We have had a great debate, I have learned a lot about these issues, I have elevated my level of understanding from down here to about this thick to really now understanding what the pluses and the minuses of these three issues are. I am not sure that all three of them would pass. I think that as we went through the debate, there would be positive arguments on both sides of the issue and that many people who now perhaps have a knee-jerk reaction to these three items would be more informed and might change their minds. But the important thing is that we would have the debate, we would have an intellectual debate that involved this Congress, that would involve all of the leaders on both sides of the issue in a constructive way to elevate the democracy in this country and get it working again.

If I were a constituent, like I said, I would be calling this Congress, I would be calling our Speaker and asking him, "What are you doing to restore democracy? Are you willing to let me participate just a little bit on three issues on November 1994 to help instruct Congress and give the Congress that starts in January 1995 just a little bit of an idea of how we feel?"

Mr. Speaker, it is part of an opportunity society. It is talking about innovation, it is talking about entrepreneurship, and it is talking about empowerment, empowering and moving some responsibility of instructing Congress back to where it should be. I believe that is what the people would do in an election, anyway, is instruct their Congresspeople on the issues. This provides a clearer forum for them to do that, and we need to take a chance. It is not a big risk. It is an opportunity to fix a system that today 80 percent of the American people feel is broken. We need to do it now. The level of frustration by the American people of this Congress is too high.

Mr. Speaker, if we in this Chamber would give the American people the opportunity to vote on term limits, on a balanced budget amendment, on a line-item veto this fall, it would go a long way toward reestablishing trust between the American people and their elected leaders in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will cosponsor H.R. 3835, the opportunity for the American people to have a voice in their government again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WOLF (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today after 8 p.m., on account of attending a wake.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT.), today, on account of personal business.

Mr. FALCOMA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), after 4 p.m. today and tomorrow, May 25, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLUTE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BATEMAN, for 5 minutes each day, on May 24 and 25.

Mr. MICHEL, for 5 minutes each day, on May 24, 25, and 26.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, on May 25.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Member (at the request of Mr. HINCHEY) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BLUTE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. EVERETT.

Mr. DREIER.

Mr. COX.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Ms. MOLINARI.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. HYDE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINCHEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. REYNOLDS in 13 instances.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. MINGE.

Mr. RANGEL in three instances.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. HAMBURG.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. SABO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOEKSTRA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COYNE.

Mr. ORTON.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. FINGERHUT.

Mrs. LLOYD.

Mr. STUDDS in two instances.

Mr. BATEMAN.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 25, 1994, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3253. A letter from the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the annual report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System during the calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3254. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on defense contracts awarded to companies in countries that provide shipbuilding subsidies or engage in ship dumping practices; and the affect of a prohibition against awarding contracts to such companies, pursuant to Public Law 102-484, section 1031(c) (106 Stat. 2489); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MINETA: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. S. 1458. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to establish time limitations on certain civil actions against aircraft manufacturers, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-525, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STUDDS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4246. A bill to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 1995 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 103-526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 439. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to ac-

company the bill (S. 24) to reauthorize the independent counsel law for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-527). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 440. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4385) to amend title 23, United States Code, to designate the National Highway System, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-528). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 441. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of a certain resolution reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 103-529). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 4476. A bill to provide for the development of a plan and a management review of the National Park System and to reform the process by which areas are considered for addition to the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mrs. FOWLER):

H.R. 4477. A bill to amend the act commonly referred to as the "Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act" to provide funding for recreational boating safety programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COPPERSMITH (for himself (by request), Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 4478. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (the Clean Water Act) to authorize appropriations in each of fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities to serve U.S. colonies, to provide water pollution control in the vicinity of the international boundary between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 4479. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) to authorize appropriations in each of fiscal years 1994-2001 for the construction of wastewater treatment works to provide water pollution control in or near the United States-Mexico border area; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 4480. A bill to expand the boundary of the Weir Farm National Historic Site in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HAMBURG (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 4481. A bill to restore the Nation's aquatic ecosystems through the voluntary cooperation of Federal, State, tribal, and

corporate and other private interests; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 4482. A bill to establish a non-Federal, for-profit Launch Services Corporation for providing space launch services to the Federal Government and other domestic and foreign customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4483. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit registered vendors to administer claims for refund of diesel fuel taxes paid on fuel used in certain buses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 4484. A bill to improve the single family housing mortgage insurance program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina:

H.R. 4485. A bill to change election day for Federal offices to the first Monday in November and to make election day a legal public holiday; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution designating September 16, 1994, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day" and authorizing display of the National League of Families POW/MIA flag; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLUG (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. ROBERTS):

H. Res. 435. Resolution directing the Committee on House Administration to make public all transcripts of proceedings and documents related to the investigation of the House Administration Committee task force to investigate the operation and management of the House post office; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 436. Resolution directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate allegations pertaining to the House post office; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FISH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EWING, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MILLER of Florida,

Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. POMBO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WOLF and Mr. ZELIFF):

H. Res. 437. Resolution directing the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Small Business to commence hearings on issues within their jurisdiction relating to the Whitewater Development Corp. and related issues; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

H. Res. 438. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a two-thirds vote to adopt a rule disallowing germane amendments to a bill or resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 244: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 291: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. LAZIO.
H.R. 972: Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 1103: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
H.R. 1203: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 1289: Mr. DORNAN and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1671: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1767: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.
H.R. 2132: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 2460: Mr. POSHARD and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2663: Mr. FISH.
H.R. 2959: Ms. MOLINARI.
H.R. 3013: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. PARKER.
H.R. 3031: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 3064: Mr. RIDGE, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 3119: Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 3173: Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 3320: Mrs. BYRNE and Mr. DORNAN.
H.R. 3347: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO and Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 3433: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BARLOW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 3486: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 3766: Mr. CONDIT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. COX, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. POMBO, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BEREUER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SARPALUIS, Mr.

HOAGLAND, Mr. DOOLEY, Ms. DANNER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANADY, Mr. KYL, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. EWING, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HORN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. WOLF, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DUNN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. LONG, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. SNOWE.
H.R. 3900: Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 3943: Mr. GRAMS.
H.R. 3973: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 4040: Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, and Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 4109: Mr. FALCOMAVALA.
H.R. 4256: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BEIL-ENSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 4271: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MANTON, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 4281: Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 4288: Mr. FALCOMAVALA, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
H.R. 4306: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 4386: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 4402: Mr. SWETT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 4412: Mr. GRANDY.
H.R. 4417: Mr. DELLUMS.
H.R. 4441: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 4451: Ms. DANNER and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.J. Res. 131: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.J. Res. 199: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LEVY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KLING, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. PARKER.
H.J. Res. 297: Mr. YATES, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.J. Res. 334: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. MYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. YATES.

H.J. Res. 351: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FALEOMAVAGA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.J. Res. 355: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr.

FARR, Mr. FISH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. YATES, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. REED, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Mr. REGULA.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. PASTOR.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. DURBIN.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. FINGERHUT.

H. Con. Res. 245: Mr. MOORHEAD and Mrs. THURMAN.

H. Res. 234: Mr. WILLIAMS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4454

By Mr. HEFLEY:

—Page 30, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 307. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 3.2 percent.

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]