

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 167 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. 1817.

□ 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. 1817) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, June 16, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment through page 2, line 20.

Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER: On Page 2, line 12, insert "(less \$10,000,000)" before ", to remain".

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled that in this time of ever increasing concern over our burgeoning national debt, the committee has chosen to include in this bill an appropriation of \$10 million as a second down payment on a \$32 million project for a project which is at best of dubious necessity. At worst, it is a \$32 million total boondoggle with no legitimate purpose.

My amendment would cut this wasteful and unnecessary spending and ultimately save the taxpayers \$32 million. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you the twisted tale of this waste of money that is proposed to be taken from the pockets of working Americans.

Once upon a time there was a facility to train Army units at Fort Irwin, CA. But alas this facility had no airport. Personnel had to be trucked 170 miles from the nearest available airfield in Nevada. We can all agree that this was a situation that needed to be remedied.

This House several years ago initiated a study to find a more efficient way to transport trainees. At one point, the Army designated Barstow-Daggett Airfield, currently a Marine Corps logistics facility, as the best available option to upgrade that facility.

The House initiated action to get funds for a \$32 million project to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. But in the meantime, Edwards Air Force Base, 30

miles away from Fort Irwin, became available for this purpose as in downsizing the workload there was reduced and we are informed that the Air Force is amenable to the Army's use of Edwards for this purpose.

George Air Force Base, another local facility 60 miles from Fort Irwin, which has been a closed military facility pursuant to the base closing situation is currently operating as a civilian airport.

Ten million dollars was included in the fiscal year 1995 appropriation to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. It has not been spent. This bill now proposes to appropriate an additional \$10 million for Barstow-Daggett, although construction will not begin until 1997.

In addition, the bill contains language that will instruct the Army to reopen the closed George Air Force Base, reopen a closed base in this time of closing bases, to be used as the interim air base for Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches initial operational capability. I will be offering an amendment later to delete that language.

Why should the taxpayers be forced to pay who knows how much to reopen a closed Air Force base when an operating Air Force base, Edwards, can be used instead?

In the meantime the Army has been working on a study which is due to be released in August, 2 months from now, to assess the various options and recommend the proper course of action. Construction at Barstow-Daggett is not due to begin until 1997.

Why cannot we wait until the study is completed in 2 months before deciding which is the best most cost-effective way to proceed? Some will argue that the roads between Fort Irwin and Edwards Air Force Base are unsafe, compared to the roads between George Air Force Base and Fort Irwin. A study by the Army indicates the opposite.

The American Automobile Association, with whom we spoke in Redlands, CA, has provided to us the following information. From Fort Irwin to Edwards Air Force Base is 90 miles, almost entirely freeway driving. No unsafe roads were mentioned.

I have a chart here that illustrates what I am saying. From Fort Irwin to George is 60 miles. Edwards, 90 miles freeway driving; Barstow-Daggett, 35 miles. Is this somewhat shorter distance, 35 miles as against 90, when the 90 miles is freeway driving, an hour and a half, worth \$32 million of taxpayer funds to upgrade Barstow-Daggett to have a 10,000-foot runway, plus the cost of reopening a closed military Air Force base at George for temporary use? I doubt that.

Now, it may be that the Army study due out in August will show that for reasons unknown to us, that is the best way. But why not wait until August to determine that?

This bill contains an appropriation of \$10 million more for Barstow-Daggett, though as I said construction cannot

begin until 1997. So if we do not fund it now it would not delay it. And the committee further instructs the Army to reopen George Air Force Base which has been closed as a part of downsizing.

Mr. Chairman, this is not cut and save. This sounds a lot more like the old tax and spend. What happened to downsizing? What happened to the rhetoric heard in this Chamber while we were slashing programs for children, the needy, veterans, and the elderly? Yes, we have to make tough choices, but our story could have a happy ending if we passed this amendment and saved the taxpayer this money.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the need to provide an airfield for Fort Irwin has been an issue since the first round of base closure in 1988, when Norton Air Force Base was closed.

The committee has appropriated funds since fiscal year 1994 to bring about the arrangement to locate the air unit at Barstow-Daggett. This will permit 60,000 troops per year to continue to receive state-of-the-art maneuver and training for close combat heavy brigades. The committee's recommendation includes the second phase of funding for a project to meet this requirement.

This is a good solution and deserves the support of this body. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very, very strong opposition to this proposal by my colleague from New York. I do not know if the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] has had the opportunity to travel to the National Training Center for the Army. It is without any question the most important and valuable asset that our military has anywhere in the world.

It is the place where we train and retrain our troops in real live war circumstance and prepare them for perhaps the worst they might face out in the battlefield. This is the base about which General Schwarzkoff said,

I commanded the 24th Mechanized Division during seven different rotations at Fort Irwin.

It is the best investment the Army has made in 35 years. The reason we did so well in Desert Storm and Desert Shield is because almost every commander we had over there had some kind of involvement in the NTC.

□ 1345

It is suggested that his amendment saves money by stopping the previously authorized project in mid-stream. This amendment, ladies and gentlemen, wastes money already approved by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the need to have a permanent airhead will not go away. The primary cost factor, distance from the national center, will not change; that is, troops are brought in numbers of 60,000 a year from various bases

around the country. They come in rotations to train at the national training center for the Army. They must be flown in to somewhere.

In the past, we have flown them into Las Vegas, where they got on buses and rode for 4½ hours, an ongoing expense. The last rotation had them coming from Edwards Air Force Base.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] probably ought to come to the territory and actually see the region we are dealing with here. A portion of it is on freeway, but approximately a third of the transportation takes place on a two-lane highway, a very, very dangerous highway in which the accident rate is something like 50 times greater than on a normal freeway; very important to recognize that in the past we have been looking for a temporary facility, Norton Air Force Base; they are considering George. That does not open up that base or reopen it. It may allow for a lease short term.

In the meantime, the Army, after a 5-year study, has come to the conclusion that, No. 1, they need a permanent airhead for bringing those troops in for this vital training; and, second, that Barstow-Daggett is the logical location which will not only serve the needs of the national training center but will also save a lot of money over the life of this very important facility.

Since 1989, I have been working with the Army to establish a permanent airfield to support the NTC rotations. We have been back and forth over all of those years.

There is little question that those who do not understand the mission of the NTC could hardly understand the importance of this facility. But, ladies and gentleman, there is absolutely no doubt that the most important thing we can do for our men and women in the armed services is to make sure that they are ready, that they are prepared by the best of training. The NTC is the best available. They need this facility desperately.

I would suggest to the gentleman that in the future, insofar as this Member is concerned, I will follow with great care what has long been a standing policy of mine that if I have a concern or an issue that affects a specific Member's district about which I do not have great expertise myself, before I carry an amendment on the floor regarding that district, I will at least show that Member the courtesy of a conversation regarding the problem. Sometimes a little light helps a lot with the discussion around here, and in this case, I must say, after 5 years of very intense work with the Army, it is very apparent that most people do not understand the vastness of this territory.

The national training center for the Army is located in a desert territory in which you can put five eastern States easily, and, in turn, the NTC is the perfect facility for live warfare kinds of games to provide the readiness we need. If you believe it is critically im-

portant that our troops be ready and prepared and well trained, vote "no" on the Nadler amendment.

Vote in support of the national training center for the Army.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is recognized.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Has the gentleman spoken?

I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will not take the full 5 minutes.

As chairman of the authorizing committee, we looked at this very, very carefully, and I would concur with what the gentleman from California had to say about the training facility. It is the premier training facility of its kind probably in the entire world.

I like to say that about the training facility at Colorado Springs, and they say, "Yes, it is, but the one in California, that is the one that here the premier facility of its kind."

And we do bring, the figure was used, 60,000 troops, plus or minus a few, in there every year to rotate in for training, and we need the kind of facilities necessary to get them in and get them out safely.

So I think what we are talking about here distance. The idea of moving them in and taking them for 4½ hours on a bus, this number of people simply makes no sense whatsoever. I think it is a matter of time, and I think it is a matter of safety.

So I would hope that we would oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from California very carefully, and I agreed with everything that was said about the national training center at Fort Irwin. It is the finest facility, an essential facility, et cetera.

We are not talking in this amendment about Fort Irwin or the National Training facility. We are talking about Barstow-Daggett, whether we should spend \$32 million, at Barstow-Daggett to make a modern airfield there and whether we should reopen George Air Force Base as a temporary facility.

The fact of the matter is the NTC is a wonderful training facility and an essential one, and we rotate 60,000 troops in there every so often and out of there every so often.

The question is: Is it worth the investment to rotate them into Barstow-Daggett instead of through Edwards Air Force Base? I agree, if it were a 4½ hour journey from Las Vegas, I probably would not offer this amendment. When this was started, when this project was initiated, when the studies were undertaken initially, Edwards Air

Force Base was not available as an option, because it was busy, busy with Air Force business.

Circumstances have changed. Now it is available. The Army has not requested this money.

The study that the gentleman holds up, the Army study that supposedly justifies this, is unavailable. It has never been released publicly. We could not get a hold of it. I do not know what it says.

We do know the Army is coming out with its study as to the best way to rotate troops into and out of Fort Irwin in 2 months. So what is the rush? Two months from now the Army will release its study as to the best way, and maybe the information that I have, and we called up the AAA and we said, "How do you get from Redlands, where this Fort Irwin is, to Edwards Air Force Base, and vice versa?" "Oh, no problem. Ninety minutes on the freeway." They did not tell us anything about a third of the way on 2-lane roads. We asked them specifically. They said it is all freeway driving, 90 minutes, you are there.

For 16 years, I commuted 140 miles up to Albany from New York, where the State legislature meets, freeway driving, no problems. Most people do that.

It will not degrade on military capability on which the gentleman was so earnest, if the troops rotating in and out of Irwin Air Force Base every few months take an hour and a half on a bus and on a freeway from Edwards Air Force Base to Fort Irwin, and the other way around, a few months later, however long a period of time they stay at Fort Irwin. We are not talking about a daily commute. We are talking about rotating in for exercises and a few weeks later rotating out and a 90-minute drive each way.

Maybe what I just said is wrong. Maybe the Army study that is due out in August will show that is wrong for some reason that we do not know here on this floor, at least we on this side do not know, in which case, fine, maybe we should develop the Barstow-Daggett base, and that information in that report will show us that we should.

But we have plenty of time. They cannot start construction until 1997, in any event. To appropriate \$10 million now is totally unnecessary, even if it is necessary to develop Barstow-Daggett. The \$10 million appropriated last year is unspent. Now we will have \$20 million unspent or wasted. Why cannot we wait 2 months until that study comes out to show what the best course of action is?

Remember, this money, for all the eloquence of the people saying how important the NTC is, this money is not requested or wanted by the Army. It should be dispositive and, therefore, this amendment should pass in the interests of saving the taxpayers' money.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just would like to respond to my good friend from New York. He raised a question as to what we might know that people on the other side of the aisle do not, and I am not sure that we know anything that the people on the other side of the aisle do not, but there are some very important facts here that I think are interesting to consider in light of the fact that we are going through currently the last stage of a major reorganization of our base structure, and that organization and reorganization has been going on now for some 6 years.

From the Army's point of view, this relationship that will exist between Barstow-Daggett and Fort Irwin is a very, very important relationship.

Let me just try to point out where there are some other relationships that exist like this. For example, Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base enjoy a relationship that is quite similar to this, for perhaps a different purpose, but a very similar kind of a thing, and as a result of that relationship, as far as I know, the Base Realignment and Closing Commission process, BRAC, has never begun to address either Fort Bragg or Pope Air Force Base because of the relationship of the role they play with each other.

More recently, of course, Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base have been together for many years, but more recently the Base Realignment and Closure Commission realized the importance of these kinds of relationships when they realigned McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey and realigned Fort Dix in New Jersey to carry forth the relationship of jointness much as is proposed by the mil con bill in creating a relationship at Barstow-Daggett and Fort Irwin.

Fort Irwin, in my opinion, is never going to go away, and if anybody knows a little bit about base structure, they know Fort Irwin, the national training center, is huge, a huge base, thousands of acres, a national training center where 60,000 troops came each year to train to hone their skills, and a relationship with an Army air base where additional training can take place and the ease of transportation is provided to provide for a more cost-efficient mode of operation is part of this consolidation that is taking place through the BRAC process and through the process of mil con bill that we are here discussing today.

And so I think from a point of cost effectiveness, from a point of distance in getting people to and from where they need to be, from the standpoint of training opportunities that are provided with close proximity of an air base and other training facilities and from commonsense opportunities that are offered and looked upon favorably by the base realignment and closure commission in each of the base closure actions that have taken place since 1989, I think it would be foolhardy for us to side with the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] in spite of the

fact that I think he has great intentions. I think the consolidated effort under way here a very essential part of the base reconfiguration project.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate my colleague yielding.

He makes a number of important points.

First, let me mention in the last year, I personally have escorted the Secretary of Defense as well as the Secretary of the Army to this very field. It was not 6 months ago the Secretary of the Army looked me in the eye, standing on the tarmac at Barstow-Daggett, and said, "This is exactly where we should have this permanent airhead."

When we went through the process of trying to figure out where to land these 60,000 troops in rotations every year, we looked at a number of facilities. Very early on, Edwards Air Force Base was taken off the list. They were not even among the remaining five being considered. Most important, they were taken off the list because of a conflict of mission. Edwards Air Force Base presently is the home of the 117 fighter bomber, home location of the B-1, where the B-2 lands, where the shuttle lands from time to time.

Indeed the C-17, will use that facility in the future, but most importantly, as the Army evaluated this question, this is what they said about Edwards Air Force Base: "Mission compatibility is of the utmost importance. This unquantifiable benefit could determine the degree of success in the NTC training mission. Unforeseen delays, postponements to the training exercises, deployment and redeployments, schedule changes and conflicts in use of air space would greatly detract from the overall benefits of the training mission exercise. The domino effect of mission incompatibility with other tenants at an airhead location would effectively smother the entire operation."

□ 1400

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SAXTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, just let me say very briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], that I believe that what the Army is after here is the recognition of the fact that training in large part relates to deployment, and, if one is going to deploy efficiently, we must have the facilities together through which deployment takes place. That is true at Fort Dix and McGuire. That is true at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, and it is equally true at Barstow-Daggett and Fort Irwin. So I think it is something we cannot ignore.

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

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. I have one simple question:

Given all the things I said, why has the Army not requested this?

Mr. SAXTON. We cannot speak for the administration and their budget. This is obviously something that makes a great deal of sense and something that military planners do not disagree with. Every branch of the service has its priorities, and we are told that this is a priority of some magnitude.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I am reminded that some 60,000 troops rotate through this area for training, that there is a constant flow of troops coming from all over the Army establishment throughout the country for this unique desert training at Barstow, and this location is rally within minutes of where they actually train.

Is that accurate?

Mr. SAXTON. That is the understanding that I have, and I would just add to that that the relationship between an airport where deployment actually takes place and the training facility at Fort Irwin is an additional reason for this consolidation to take place.

Mr. HUNTER. And the last documentation that the Army did on this did recommend Barstow-Daggett, at least from the documents that I have seen.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing that to our attention, and that would provide a more full answer to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be brief on this because I think most of it has already been said, but again listen to what the proponents of this arrangement and of this appropriation are saying. They are saying Fort Irwin, the National Training Center, is very important. Granted. They are saying that the Army at one point asked for funds to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. Granted, when they could not use Edwards Air Force Base. They are saying that Edwards Air Force Base cannot be used, it is not good enough. It is being used now. In fact there is mission incompatibility, but there is decreased Air Force use of Edwards because of less Air Force use. That we know for the last few years, and the fact of the matter is again, the Army is doing a study of what the best available options are, what is the best way of rotating troops in and out of Irwin, the most cost-effective way and the best way for mission readiness at

Fort Irwin. That study is coming out in August. But we do not want to wait for that study. We want to jump the gun. That is silly because that risks wasting a lot of taxpayers' money. None of the money appropriated here in this bill on this subject can be spent at Barstow-Daggett before 1997, which is to say before the next appropriation bill will have been passed in any event, so why not remove this money, wait for the August study, and if they still have the mind that this is the way to go, fine. Next year they can appropriate it, and they can build it just as fast, but if that study shows, as apparently the Army thinks it may, because the Army is not requesting this money. With all of this rhetoric we have heard on this floor about how important this money is, that our combat capability will be degraded without it and so forth, the Army has not asked for this money, and in this climate, when we are taking money away from food stamps, from school lunches, from Medicare, from Medicaid, from college loans, from just name it, we are proposing to give the Army \$32 million it does not say it needs, and it does not request, and it does not want because we cannot wait 2 months for a study that may show us a cheaper, better way to do it sounds to me like pork, not military readiness.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Mr. Chairman, no State has been impacted by the base closure process more than the State of California. Many of the programs and personnel associated with former military installations in California have either been eliminated or transferred to other States. That being said, there are still fundamental missions which occur at facilities such as the National Army Training Center at Fort Irwin. The Army has spent considerable time and resources addressing the need to establish a permanent airfield to support Fort Irwin and is now moving forward with a cost-effective plan that has been endorsed by Congress and the Secretary of the Army. Voting in favor of the gentleman's amendment will only result in needless delays in meeting this critical requirement.

The Nadler amendment unravels 5 years of the Army's planning for a permanent airfield to support Fort Irwin. The decision to study California alternatives for the NTC airhead was undertaken by the Army at its own initiative beginning on December 13, 1989. The analysis of alternative study was completed in October of 1993. Here is the specific finding of that study before it went to Forscam and the Military Traffic Management Command:

Fort Irwin does not have a reliable, full-time tactical airfield usable by fixed-wing, heavy-life, and wide-body aircraft. Long-term operation at McCarran is questionable. If this

project is not provided, air operations at the NTC will continue to be sub-standard. Limited Army funding will continue to be spent to bring troops overland from great distances, training time will be lost, and command and control will be difficult. The Barstow-Daggett alternative was found to be the most economically cost-efficient as calculated over the life of the project.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here now just a couple of years. The gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] and I came at the same time. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has the district next to mine. We both represent people from the desert. We understand the desert probably a little better than someone from across the country. We know what the road is like driving from Fort Irwin over to Edwards, and it is a dangerous road, and I think that this amendment should be defeated.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Nadler amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize the point that gentleman just made.

Up until this most recent rotation where troops came from Edwards to the training center, the troops were being sent by bus for 4½ hours from Las Vegas. To say the least, it was a long ways away from the way they should have come to arrive in a training setting, a war kind of setting.

Recently for a short time Edwards Air Force Base became an experiment as a temporary airhead, but the people who designated that temporary airhead have no idea what that road is really like. One-third of the distance, about 33 miles, is along a very, very dangerous two-lane highway. It is only some time when someone is going to rush around and run into one of those caravans of troops.

Mr. McKEON. Reclaiming my time, again, both of us coming from that area, we know when we talk about a two-lane road it is a little different out there than it is here. Two lane road there, it is up and down because of the flash flooding coming off the hills, and they have to leave low spots in the road, and so we get ups and downs, and I have had friends killed on that highway. I understand the danger there.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Exactly, and if the gentleman continues to yield, I must say that I can understand in part, I suppose, what the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] is saying, but, if he would ride that roadway, he would understand the difference. What we need to do is have a permanent facility where these troops can come and be in the training environment. Barstow-Daggett is the ideal location. It is the cheapest solution, short-term and long-term, without any question. This is the most important training center in the world, and a no vote on the

Nadler amendment indeed is in support of the National Training Center for the Army, and I encourage my colleagues to recognize just how critical this training center is to our national defense.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speaker from California and to say that I oppose the Nadler amendment and that I hope my colleagues will join in supporting the hard work of the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and her subcommittee. Their decision with regard to this airstrip was based on the facts, and the facts are that the National Training Center is a major contributor to the national defense mission. The transport of our service men and women in and out of there is a very important component of their mission, and, if the Nadler amendment is adopted, instead of a convenient airstrip 37 miles away, however, far the distance, it will be a much farther distance that they will have to be transported.

So I will say the facts are with the committee on this decision. I hope that the Members of this body will support the chairwoman, support the committee, and vote no on the Nadler amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman. I rise today to voice my opposition to the amendment to strike funding for the expansion of Barstow-Daggett Airfield in San Bernardino County, CA.

The expansion of the runway of Barstow-Daggett Airfield is needed to accommodate aircraft that will bring in the thousands of Army troops that annually train at Fort Irwin in the California desert. Barstow-Daggett Airport is located only 30 miles from Fort Irwin. Since the closure of Norton Air Force Base in San Bernardino, the Army has not had a permanent site to fly in troops for transport to the Fort Irwin training area.

As we all know, desert training is more critical than ever for our Nation's troops. Without Barstow-Daggett Airport, our troops will lose valuable training time being transported by bus from more distant airfields.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that I am persuaded to support this military construction project is that it has been authorized as part of the Defense Authorization Act for 2 straight years. I also understand that the Secretary of the Army supports the project. These facts persuade me that this project is worthwhile and has received the proper scrutiny and approval of the relevant authorizing committee, during times of both Democratic and Republican committee leadership.

For these reasons, I will support this project and vote against the amendment to strike the project's funding, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 329, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—100

Andrews	Hinchev	Pastor
Baldacci	Hoekstra	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Becerra	Jacobs	Petri
Bentsen	Johnston	Ramstad
Bonior	Kanjorski	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Reynolds
Cardin	Klug	Rivers
Christensen	LaFalce	Roukema
Clayton	Levin	Royce
Collins (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Collins (MI)	Lincoln	Sanders
Conyers	Lipinski	Schroeder
Cooley	Lofgren	Schumer
DeFazio	Lowey	Scott
Dellums	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Deutsch	Maloney	Skaggs
Dingell	Markey	Slaughter
Doggett	McKinney	Stark
Duncan	Meehan	Studds
Ehlers	Menendez	Thurman
Engel	Mfume	Torricelli
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Evans	Minge	Velazquez
Fattah	Mink	Ward
Fields (LA)	Moran	Waters
Filner	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Furse	Neal	Williams
Ganske	Neumann	Woolsey
Gephardt	Nussle	Wyden
Green	Obey	Yates
Gutierrez	Olver	Zimmer
Hastings (FL)	Orton	
Hilliard	Owens	

NOES—329

Abercrombie	Chapman	Flanagan
Ackerman	Chenoweth	Foglietta
Allard	Chrysler	Foley
Archer	Clay	Forbes
Armey	Clement	Ford
Bachus	Clinger	Fowler
Baesler	Clyburn	Fox
Baker (CA)	Coble	Frank (MA)
Baker (LA)	Coburn	Franks (CT)
Ballenger	Coleman	Franks (NJ)
Barcia	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Combust	Frisa
Barrett (NE)	Condit	Frost
Bartlett	Costello	Funderburk
Barton	Cox	Gallegly
Bass	Coyne	Gekas
Bateman	Cramer	Geren
Beilenson	Crane	Gibbons
Bereuter	Crapo	Gilchrest
Berman	Cremeans	Gillmor
Bevill	Cubin	Gilman
Bilbray	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Danner	Goodlatte
Bishop	Davis	Goodling
Bliley	de la Garza	Gordon
Blute	Deal	Goss
Boehlert	DeLauro	Graham
Boehner	DeLay	Greenwood
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Gunderson
Bono	Dickey	Gutknecht
Borski	Dicks	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Brewster	Dooley	Hamilton
Browder	Doolittle	Hancock
Brown (CA)	Dornan	Hansen
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Harman
Brownback	Dreier	Hastert
Bryant (TN)	Dunn	Hastings (WA)
Bryant (TX)	Durbin	Hayes
Bunn	Edwards	Hayworth
Bunning	Ehrlich	Hefley
Burr	Emerson	Hefner
Burton	English	Heineman
Buyer	Ensign	Herger
Callahan	Everett	Hilleary
Calvert	Ewing	Hobson
Camp	Farr	Hoke
Canady	Fawell	Holden
Castle	Fazio	Horn
Chabot	Fields (TX)	Hostettler
Chambliss	Flake	Houghton

Hoyer	Mica	Shuster
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Sisisky
Hutchinson	Mineta	Skeen
Hyde	Molinaro	Skelton
Inglis	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Istook	Montgomery	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Johnson (SD)	Morella	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Solomon
Johnson, Sam	Myers	Souder
Jones	Myrick	Spence
Kaptur	Nethercutt	Spratt
Kasich	Ney	Stearns
Kelly	Norwood	Stenholm
Kennedy (RI)	Oberstar	Stockman
Kennelly	Ortiz	Stokes
Kildee	Oxley	Stump
Kim	Packard	Stupak
King	Pallone	Talent
Kingston	Parker	Tanner
Klecza	Paxon	Tate
Klink	Payne (VA)	Tauzin
Knollenberg	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (NC)
LaHood	Pickett	Tejeda
Lantos	Pombo	Thomas
Largent	Pomeroy	Thompson
Latham	Porter	Thornberry
LaTourette	Portman	Thornton
Laughlin	Poshard	Tiahrt
Lazio	Pryce	Torkildsen
Leach	Quillen	Torres
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Towns
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Traficant
Lightfoot	Rahall	Upton
Linder	Reed	Vento
Livingston	Regula	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Richardson	Volkmer
Longley	Riggs	Vucanovich
Lucas	Roberts	Waldholtz
Manton	Roemer	Walker
Manzullo	Rogers	Walsh
Martinez	Rohrabacher	Wamp
Martini	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)
Mascara	Roth	Waxman
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Weldon (FL)
McCarthy	Sabo	Weldon (PA)
McDade	Salmon	Weller
McDermott	Sanford	White
McHale	Sawyer	Whitfield
McHugh	Saxton	Wicker
McInnis	Scarborough	Wilson
McIntosh	Schaefer	Wise
McKeon	Schiff	Wolf
McNulty	Seastrand	Wynn
Meek	Serrano	Young (AK)
Metcalf	Shadegg	Young (FL)
Meyers	Shaw	Zeliff
	Shays	

NOT VOTING—5

Gejdenson	McCollum	Rose
Jefferson	Moakley	

□ 1438

Mrs. CHENOWETH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Messrs. BRYANT of Texas, COBLE, WHITFIELD, BARCIA, TOWNS, McDERMOTT, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. PELOSI, Messrs. MFUME, WATTS of North Carolina, PETRI, ORTON, NEAL of Massachusetts, SCOTT, and DELLUMS, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, \$588,243,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$66,184,000 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. 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 Mr. ROYCE: Page 3, line 3, strike "\$588,243,000" and insert "\$571,843,000".

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment targets two construction projects which were not requested by the Pentagon but were added on by the committee. The first item spends \$6 million to repair a foundry at a shipyard which Congress voted to close in the 1991 base closing round.

Why are we upgrading this foundry and this propeller shop when the Navy has not made a request? If the hope is that the Pentagon will keep this one foundry at the yard open for the long haul, does it not make sense to, at least, wait to see if the DOD makes a request before approving a \$6 million upgrade? This sets a bad precedent for all base closures past and future and opens up a Pandora's box for Congress. So let us take it out of the bill.

Let me repeat one point: DOD has confirmed that this is not in the future years' defense plan from 1996 to 2001.

The second item also not requested spends \$10.4 million for a new gymnasium at a base which already has a gym. The Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has racquetball. It has a gym with Nautilus equipment and free weights. It has basketball courts, volleyball, tennis courts, three softball fields.

We are going to spend here \$10.4 million for a facility which will add badminton, squash, aerobics, and paddleball when there are already 10 private gyms within 5 miles of the base?

I can only tell my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that with a base at Bangor Submarine Base 15 miles away with a gym, a gym free to all Active duty personnel, maybe we should buy a bus if there is overflow. But there is no evidence that there is overflow at the existing gym. There is a YMCA less than a mile away. Maybe we should look at contracting out for the overflow. But again, we have no evidence of it. This is \$10.5 million that could be spent for more urgent projects.

Mr. Chairman, there are many supporters of a strong national defense in this House, defense hawks, and I am one. But many of you are also deficit hawks here. And these projects are not needed. They will not add to our national security. They were not requested. In fact, the overall \$500 million added by the committee comes on

top of \$500 million added last year but not requested last year, and the total bill is now \$2.4 billion more than the 1995 appropriation.

This is an ominous trend, colleagues. The Department of Defense already has a \$1 billion backlog in deferred maintenance. We should not be spending money on unrequested projects. So join with the Pork Busters, the National Taxpayers Union, the Business Executives for National Security, Citizens Against Government Waste and Citizens for a Sound Economy in supporting this amendment. This is the first test of an appropriations bill on the floor this year. Let us not fail that test. Let us vote to try to reduce this spending and move towards a balanced budget.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am curious why out of all projects included in this bill, the gentleman chose these two. I would guess he thinks the mandated physical fitness and recreational activities of 12,500 naval personnel is of no importance. Because when the committee asked the Navy if this project was mission essential or critical in this fiscal year the Navy's response was yes—that it was essential to provide for quality of life and physical fitness of service members.

And, I would like to take this opportunity to tell the gentleman that our subcommittee held 14 hearings this year and our major focus was on "what is quality of life?" When asked, Sergeant Major Kidd of the Army told the committee that it was "a good place to work, a good place to train, a good place to live, and a good place to have recreation."

Does the gentleman oppose our naval personnel being well fit to serve this country when called?

And does the gentleman not believe it is essential that the individuals working in the foundry in Philadelphia—which is to remain active after the yard's scheduled closure—should be threatened by the many environmental, safety, and health problems associated with the facilities deficiencies? When the committee asked the Navy their answer was, absolutely not. That the combined serious deficiencies in industrial ventilation, lighting, stress relieving ovens, and weight handling equipment greatly increase the chances of a catastrophic accident and personal injury. And, on top of that a recent inspection revealed the foundry is in immediate jeopardy of being cited by EPA and OSHA.

Mr. Chairman, why these two projects have been targeted, I do not understand. I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

□ 1445

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear that I think this bill contains far too much spending. I intend to vote

against the bill, because it is far in excess of the President's request, as well as last year's budget. However, I think the attack on this particular facility at Bremerton is unfair.

In this bill, there are an awful lot of items which are labeled "quality of life." Unfortunately, many of those items are targeted to improve the life of people who already have a pretty high quality of life. That is why I support most of the amendments that are going to be made to cut this bill. That is why I support the Neumann-Furse amendment, for instance, which tries to strike construction for units costing more than \$200,000 each.

However, this proposal, in my view, strikes at the needs of the people in the services who most need our help. As I understand the situation, there are over 12,000 seamen who are located in this facility in Washington. Many of them live on board ship for at least 6 months at a time. They live in very cramped quarters, and when they do get to shore, they need some recreational opportunities.

As my staff has been able to determine, the recreational opportunities for the enlisted people at the lower pay grades are far less than what they need, given the demands put on them in that area.

Therefore, it seems to me that if we are going to go after projects in this bill, we ought to go after projects for the most comfortable, not for the most uncomfortable, not for the enlisted guy at the bottom of the totem pole who very seldom gets very much attention paid to his or her needs.

Mr. Chairman, I would also simply ask why it is that these two projects have been especially singled out by the sponsor of the amendment. I would point out that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], who is offering the amendment, wrote the committee last year requesting funding for two projects at the Los Alamos Reserve Center totaling \$11.9 million.

The committee, which was then under my chairmanship, with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] on the subcommittee in the two lead spots, approved \$4.2 million to provide for a new logistics facility for him. I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] recalls this committee's favorable response to his request to meet a special need in his district at that time?

Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the gentleman going after projects unneeded. I am going to vote against plenty of them myself this afternoon. As I said, I am going to vote against this entire bill because it is far too high. However, in this instance, I find going after the project, especially in Washington, to be especially quaint, given the needs of the enlisted people in that area. I think we ought to turn this amendment down, in the interests of fairness.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, as a point, I had a letter last year from the author of this current amendment for two projects. The gentleman made the point that these projects were not requested by the administration, they were not requested by the Pentagon.

We have two projects here that the gentleman requested last year that were not requested by anybody. We funded the projects, because we felt the gentleman knew what was good for his district, and something that was needed for the people in his district.

It seems to me it is a little bit unusual for the taxpayers, Citizens Against Government Waste, to go through all this bill and find two projects, find two projects in the Navy, that were worthy of having the gentleman's sponsorship of these amendments. I strongly oppose these amendments.

I think it is ridiculous that we would even be discussing them here on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply close by saying that I think we owe more to those 12,000 seamen in this case than to simply tell them that when they come on shore from their ship, that they ought to use the Y.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Minge-Royce amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a case of mistaken identity colleagues. The propeller shop at the site of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is open and its working men and women are busy today providing for the defense of our Nation. They perform some of the most sensitive and important work in developing finely manufactured propellers for submarines and surface combatants.

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard was ordered closed by the Base Closure Commission. We, in Philadelphia, accept that, though we continue to believe it was the wrong decision.

We are working to convert the yard to become a commercial shipyard. Two companies—one, an international shipbuilder and another a respected U.S. ship overhauling firm—are deeply interested in creating at least 4,000 new jobs at the yard.

But the propeller shop at the Navy yard was never part of the order to close.

Manufacturing propellers for carriers, subs and other Navy vessels is a vital endeavor. The Navy must maintain that capacity.

This winter, I wrote to the Navy concerned about rumors that it was considering moves to sell off the propeller shop and foundry.

Not true, said Assistant Navy Secretary Pirie. He said, "We share your view that the propeller shop and foundry are required to support our operational forces in the future. Thus, we did not recommend their closure."

Based on that continued commitment by the Navy, I worked with the Navy to develop this project to renovate the propeller facility.

This project was authorized in the bill we passed, just last week. The Navy has already completed the 35 percent design for the bulk of this project. That is the threshold requirement demanded by our subcommittee as well as by the National Security Committee. Our subcommittee has confirmed this with the Navy. Thus, the argument that this is not wanted by the Navy is wrong.

This project would construct new stress relieving ovens to insure the structural integrity of modern propellers. In addition, the project would improve worker safety by meeting OSHA requirements. This is dangerous work. Maybe that is not something that the porkbusters are interested about. I have a list of at least 26 workers who have sustained injuries at the prop shop. A pattern maker and a molder who had molten metal splash in their eye. A rigger who was stuck by metal pieces. How can they call protecting workers from serious injury pork?

In this case, the porkbusters have, again, identified the wrong man, at the wrong time, at the wrong place. Do they want to give up our edge in the sensitive technology of developing and manufacturing propellers to the Japanese and Europe? That is what they would do by not investing the money to keep this facility—which is an open facility—state of the art.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It defies the intent of this Congress of maintaining our national security.

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

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I will include for the RECORD a letter from Cheryl Kandarar of the Navy to the honorable chairman of the subcommittee which says that this shop and foundry "provide essential services to the fleet, much of which is classified and cannot be supported by another source." This letter is dated June 20, 1995.

For any Member of this body to stay on the floor and infer that somehow the Navy is considering closing this is certainly shortsighted at best, and beyond that, just trying to demagogue on an issue where we have done a good job in removing those items from defense spending that are clearly not wanted by the military.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,  
Washington, DC, June 20, 1995.

Hon. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH,  
Chairman, Military Construction Subcommittee,  
House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request for information re-

garding Navy's plans for facilities that remain open after implementation of BRAC actions at Naval Shipyard Philadelphia.

The Propeller Shop and Foundry will remain open to support our operational forces for the foreseeable future. These facilities provide essential services to the fleet, much of which is classified, and can not be supported by another source. Accordingly, they were not recommended for closure to the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

As always, if I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

CHERYL KANDARAS,  
Principal Deputy.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have to take a back seat to anybody for coming down here time and time again with amendments to strike things that I think are pork in appropriation bills, and we will do it some more, probably.

That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, that, as I assumed the chairmanship of the authorization committee for Milcon, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and I worked very, very carefully together to systematically make sure that we had very strict criteria, because we know these particular bills are bills that are subject to pork enough. We did not want that to happen. We wanted to make sure that did not happen. We were very careful to do that.

The bill that we produced and that we passed here last week and the bill that we are considering today, are mirror images of each other. There is nothing in this bill that we are considering today that was not authorized in the bill last week.

Mr. Chairman, on these two projects we are talking about, I think the gentlemen that have spoken before me have made the case pretty well that the propeller shop is something that is absolutely crucial. It is the only facility of its kind that we have in the United States. Yes, it was not requested this time because this is a phase 3 project. This is the third phase of three phases of a project, and it is a very crucial project.

As for the physical fitness facility out in Washington, there was a great case made for that physical facility out there. Mr. Chairman, these things, even though they were not requested this year, they were on the priority list.

I would like to note that I also have the request from last year of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], and not only were these not requested last year, but they were not on anybody's priority list last year, and yet the gentleman from California felt they were very important. They may have been very important. I have not looked into it to see if they were or not. However, the ones we did, they had to be on a priority list or they did not get funded. These were on the priority list.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members to vote "no" on the Royce amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA], and my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON]. This is an example of diligent research that has reached the wrong conclusion.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I am one who has, in fact, voted against and worked against projects that bring money to my own State and to my own district. I will take a back seat to no one in standing in opposition to the expenditure of funds that I think are unnecessary.

I think I understand what happened in the offering of this amendment. There was a review of the military construction appropriation bills, and someone looked at this and quite plausibly drew the conclusion that here is a project that is not wanted by the Navy, that is going to be located in a base that is going to be closed under the 1991 BRACC decision.

Both of those two assumptions are wrong. No. 1, this project is wanted by the Navy. Believe me, the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is no friend of the Navy brass. We have been involved in litigation all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, in which I was a plaintiff and many of our colleagues here were plaintiffs, fighting tooth and nail the Navy's recommendation and decision to close the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

In 1991, when that recommendation was made, the Navy expressly and specifically excluded the propeller shop and all of the things that serve the propeller shop. They looked at the whole base. We think they made the wrong decision about the whole base, but we certainly agree they made the right decision about preserving this from the 1991 decision.

The Navy has drawn the conclusion, as we have heard the authorizer say, the appropriators say, the Navy has reached the decision that this infrastructure is essential to the maintenance of the fleet. The Navy wants the project.

No. 2 is the assumption that this is pouring Federal tax dollars into a base that is on the base closure list. It is true that the naval shipyard is on the base closure list. It is true that the naval base is on the base closure list. It is not true that the propeller shop is on the base closure list.

Mr. Chairman, what was diligent work to look at this I think, respectfully, became the wrong conclusion. This is not a project that has been rejected by the Navy, it is not a project that is on a closed base, it is an ongoing project that has been reported by the Navy. I think it is worthy of the



recommendation that the Committee on Appropriations has made.

Mr. Chairman, I say this one more time. I know it is the practice of people to come to the floor and be against expenditure of funds in everyone's district except their own. That is a time-honored practice here. I have gone on record with my vote and my voice in my efforts to oppose some expenditure of dollars in and around my district. I would be happy to supplement the RECORD here with a list of times I have done that. I am not so foolish to actually say it on the floor, but I would be happy to supplement the RECORD with a list.

For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of my colleagues who are concerned, as we all are, about the size of the Federal Government not to make the wrong decision here and support this amendment. They should oppose the amendment being offered.

□ 1500

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, one of the responsibilities that we in the Congress have is to take the recommendations of the administration and then act to authorize and appropriate various levels of dollars. That is our fundamental responsibility.

If the sponsor of this amendment thinks that we should not fund anything except what the administration asks for, then in fact this year he will be opposing \$9.7 billion of items that this Congress added in to defense spending, both in the bill that we passed last year and in the MILCON bill that we are about to act on today.

What I find a little bit disingenuous here is that the gentleman who offered this amendment last week voted in favor of the B-2 bomber, which I happen to oppose, by the way, despite the support of my party. He voted in favor of a \$533 million add-on that the administration did not request. If you are going to be consistent, be consistent across the board.

In addition, my good friend and colleague came into my office on May 23 at 4 in the afternoon bringing in some constituents from California, and asked me as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development to put in \$34 million this year for the DAGGRS program, which would cost \$25 million next year, \$25 million in 1998 and \$50 million in 1999. So here is a gentleman offering an amendment to eliminate \$16 million that has been authorized and is about to be appropriated, when he himself came into my office and said,

Well, Mr. Chairman, this hasn't been approved yet, and it's not been requested by the Pentagon, but could you see your way fit to put \$34 million in this year's bill because it will really help me out back in my district.

Mr. Chairman, I have a problem with that. I have a problem with Members of

Congress who want to have two standards. I have fought long and hard as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development to take out items that were not justified by the military. That is not the case here.

Anyone who works with our Navy knows that the advantage of our Navy over the former Soviet fleet and Russian fleet is our quietness, the ability to go through the oceans of the world and operate in a quiet manner. That is almost totally due to our propellers. Our propellers are only made in one shop, owned by the Government, in the entire country. That one shop, with a foundry, is in Philadelphia. As a matter of fact, the Russians have stolen the technology for our propeller operations, sold it to the Chinese, and are now competing with us in terms of quietness.

What we have on the floor today is an amendment that takes \$6 million away from improving that capability. This is not some pork project for some company. This is not some add-on. This is to improve a facility that today is costing American lives, in working to give our Navy the best technology available in terms of quite submarines and quiet ships.

Mr. Chairman, I have a real problem with this. I take a back seat to no one when it comes to budget cutting. I will invite our colleagues to my office to show them my "Golden Bulldogs" which I too take great pride in receiving from Citizens Against Government Waste and the other watchdog groups.

But we have to look beyond simplistic answers in trying to control spending. That is what this is. It is a simplistic notion that is not based on fact.

The Navy has stated on the record that this facility is vital for our national security interests. It is vital for our Navy and our submarines to be the quietest in the world. This \$6 million item is to improve the safety of those workers who work at that shipyard facility. It has nothing to do with base closing.

The Philadelphia Navy Shipyard and the Philadelphia Naval Base, as my colleague said earlier, is in fact closing this September. But the Navy has never recommended closing the propeller shop because it is the only Government-owned and operated facility of its kind in the entire country.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage our colleagues to stand up and do the right thing here and to vote against this amendment because it is wrongheaded. It is not in the best interests of our country, it is not in the best interests of our Navy.

And if we want to be consistent, perhaps I would ask the authors if they are going to stand up and oppose all \$9.7 billion that this Congress last week put in, above and beyond what President Clinton's administration requested for defense spending. Because if you are going to be consistent, then that is exactly what you should do, and

that is not in fact what the responsibility of this body and the other body is.

Our responsibility is to take the recommendations, the requests of the administration, to hold hearings and to finally act on those. In this case, we have projects that the administration says are warranted but just those that were not originally requested.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and to vote "yes" for what is important, as determined by the distinguished chairwoman of this subcommittee and the ranking member of this subcommittee, who have both done such an admirable job with the minimal amount of defense dollars that we have available to spend in this fiscal year.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, to me this is an amendment that just cannot be defended. It is my understanding that this is the only place that we make these propellers anywhere in the United States. What are we going to do if we do not have this facility? Where are we going to get them, from China or the Russians who stole our technology?

To me this just borders on being ridiculous. It is very easy to come in here and talk about, let us make some cuts here, Did it ever occur to you that it just might be possible that the Citizens Against Government Waste do not know what they are talking about when they target and say this is a good project to cut?

We are talking about quality of life. I have been on this committee for many, many years and we have fought for quality of life for our men and women in the services for all these years. The gymnasium that we are talking about, this is a quality of life.

This helps us with retention. This helps us with morale for our men and women, and especially our sailors that go out and spend so much time on submarines and aircraft carriers. When they come in, they don't need to be having to go join up with a temporary membership in the Y or go to some public playground. These are things that are vital to the quality of life for our men and women in the service.

It seems to me that this is something that is totally out of place. On the one hand we are looking at closing a facility that Bragg did not say you are going to close. This is a facility that makes something that is vital to the defense of this country. On the other hand, you are talking about a facility that is vital for the morale and for the retention of the people in our Armed Forces.

Ladies and gentlemen, you folks that are not here to listen to this debate, I hope wherever you are that you will come and you will soundly, soundly defeat this amendment, because in my view this committee has done an admirable job, not only on this bill but over the years. We have had a committee that is so bipartisan doing the things



that we think are best for this great country.

This is one committee, to my knowledge since I have been in the Congress, we have not appeared one time that I know of in the *National Enquirer*, any of the tabloids or any of the exposé programs on television. This is a committee that has worked in a bipartisan way to try to accommodate Members for the betterment of the men and women in the service and do the things that are best for the defense of this great country of ours. I would urge a strong, overwhelming, majority vote against this ludicrous amendment.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the time has come when we should recognize really what is the issue that we will be voting on shortly. The issue is not whether a propeller shop should be maintained or improved. The issue is not whether we should have improved recreation facilities. The issue is whether the funds should be appropriated in the summer of 1995 to do that. What I would like to do is take the time available to me to outline why it is that the Pork Busters are submitting that this is not the time to appropriate these funds.

The Pork Busters Coalition recently adopted a 5-point military construction criteria. These are taken from the 1995 defense authorization bill, fiscal year 1995, which was passed in 1994.

Using this objective 5-point test, we found that there were several add-on projects, but these were two of the more curious. Neither of the projects were requested by the Department of Defense and both fail, as I have indicated, the 5-point statutory test. My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] and I are offering these amendments to eliminate funding for these projects.

I would like to first look at the foundry. We are simply proposing that \$6 million be eliminated from the appropriations. We are not requesting that the Navy close the foundry. That is a mischaracterization of the amendment.

This foundry project is estimated by the appropriations and the authorizing committee to cost \$6 million. The fact of the matter is, the design work is only 15 percent complete, and even that 15 percent work indicates that is a \$6.8 million project. We face the prospect that there will be substantial overruns, and that this Congress will be asked time and again to authorize and appropriate yet more money. Let us wait until the design work is complete.

Going beyond that, the money is requested for an upgrade. The shipyard was approved for closing but the foundry, which is to survive, is the sole source of submarine propellers. We certainly recognize that.

But after the shipyard is to close, according to the Business Executives for National Security, this is to provide

surge production capability. Spending \$6 million before the Defense Department requests it to enhance surge capability, at a time when submarine production is hardly a growth industry, seems an expense of luxury that detracts from more pressing defense needs.

Going beyond that, the defenders of these projects have said they do not have the money to put into the projects unless they are approved this year. The fact of the matter is the Defense Department's future years defense program does not include these projects. According to the Business Executives for National Security, again, or BENS, these future years defense programs do not include this project at all.

What we ought to do is to wait until the Defense Department has its act together and has made the formal request to the committee.

I would like to turn briefly to the facility in Bremerton, WA. Neither the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] nor I are saying that the men and women that use that base should not have more recreation facilities. We are not here to pass judgment on that. We are not here to lower the morale of the men and women in our Armed Forces.

What we are simply saying is we have to make tough choices. If we have a year-by-year budget, and if the Defense Department and the administration are coming in with priority projects, let us honor those priorities. Let us work in that fashion.

This is perhaps an appropriate upgrade to the facilities for 1996 appropriations consideration. But as we add these in year by year in the authorizing and the appropriating committees, what do we find? We find that these projects are going predominantly to the districts of the Members on the committees. In fact, in terms of location by home districts, the Members gave themselves 52 percent of the projects and 53 percent of the cash that were needed for the unrequested construction efforts.

This, I think, is a telling reason why we should schedule these projects at a time when the Defense Department itself has requested that the projects be given priority.

In closing, I would urge that my colleagues join with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE] and myself and the pork busters in saying no to these projects in fiscal year 1996 appropriations.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

I am from Bremerton, WA. I was born about 250 yards from the current facility in the Puget Sound Naval Base Hospital. There are no recreational facilities within 1 hour's walk of the shipyard. We have 8,000 sailors in Bremer-

ton, with the *Nimitz* coming back in a few months with another 3,500.

It is so easy to get up here and to take on a project like this. I called the base commander and I asked him, I said, "Admiral Designate Yount, is this project required?" He said, "It is absolutely required." He said, "I don't have the facilities for these young men and women. We now have women on every one of these ships that is in Bremerton, seven ships, so we have to have new facilities for the women as well."

□ 1515

"And the pool here was built in 1922." I mean, it is absolute disaster. And this is one of those things where we have just got to try to do the right thing. We have got to, I think, support our committees. We have had people here from both the authorization and appropriations committee who looked at it.

I called the Naval Audit Service who had just been out there 2 weeks ago and I asked them, "You guys look at these things independently, right?" And they said, "Yes, for Secretary Perry, we look at them independently." And I said, "Is this physical training facility needed?" And they said, "Congressman, it was an embarrassment to look at this facility. It is needed." And I said, "Well, that is good enough for me."

I have seen it. It is in my community. There are no facilities that have been mentioned that have any space available for additional people. I just hope we can support our committee leadership. This is why we have a committee system here. Both the authorizing and appropriations committee support it. Let us vote down this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to strongly object to this amendment which would eliminate funding for a critical fitness facility center at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

This is unfortunately a cynical attempt by some of my colleagues to kill what is a legitimate program in an effort to gain some cheap, short-lived notoriety for being alleged budget cutters. This is outright demagoguery and I believe it is time to set the record straight on this matter. Let me begin by clearing up a couple of assertions being thrown around by the authors of this amendment.

First of all, the gentlemen offering this amendment have stated that the Navy has not identified this as a priority. Not true. The fitness facility is in fact budgeted and is included in the Navy's 5-year defense plan. Moreover, a recent study done by the Navy audit service which assesses the legitimacy of Navy MILCON projects has determined that this project is needed and that current facilities are woefully inadequate.

Another internal Navy document says that if the fitness facility is not constructed " \* \* \* personnel will continue to be forced to use the extremely overcrowded facilities. Access to recreational activities will be greatly restricted producing a negative impact on the morale and physical conditioning of Navy personnel."

The chairwoman of the MILCON subcommittee has advised that additional money spent on MILCON beyond what was requested by the President be used for projects

that both improve the quality of life for Armed Forces personnel and that are supported and required by the Services. This project meets those two criteria.

So let me set the record straight in this regard by saying that the assertion that the Navy does not consider this project a priority, does not have it in their budget plan, or does not want it, is all patently false.

The second assertion made by the authors of this amendment is that this facility is not really needed because the sailors can go to one of four private fitness facilities in the surrounding area.

Here are the facts. There is not one fitness facility that is less than a 1 hour walk from the base. And of the fitness facilities in the area, only one—the Kitsap County Golf and Country Club—has no waiting list for those who wish to join. This may be fine for the officers stationed at the shipyard, but 85 percent of the young men and women stationed there are of enlisted rank. I would suggest to my colleagues that we cannot have it both ways. We cannot pay our enlisted men and women the paltry salaries that we do and at the same time expect them to finance a membership at the local country club.

Mr. Chairman, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard was designed and constructed to be just that, a shipyard. What exists today however, is more on the order of a homeport, with seven ships berthed in what had initially been a busy overhaul and repair yard up until 1987. Before then, the number of military personnel residing at the shipyard numbered less than 1,000. Since the assignment of the *Nimitz* carrier in 1987, the number of military personnel in the shipyard has risen to between 7,000–8,000. This number will continue to rise as the Puget Sound area accepts more and more personnel as a result of BRAC realignment.

Because of the intended mission of PSNS, there is simply not the kind of infrastructure on the base to accommodate anywhere near the number of personnel that exist there now. As such Mr. Chairman, I have done my best over the past couple of years to see to it that the sailors stationed there have access to adequate housing, medical, day care, and other quality of life facilities that Secretary Perry has deemed so critical to the readiness of our Armed Forces.

Access to fitness facilities is clearly something the Defense Department considers to be a high priority in order to ensure a desirable quality of life for our young men and women serving in the Armed Forces. Moreover, in addition to quality of life considerations, fitness is now a mission requirement for all navy personnel with each sailor required to pass a physical fitness test twice annually.

The current facility—built in 1942—does not even begin to meet the needs of the sailors in the shipyard. It is dilapidated and woefully inadequate in size to accommodate the 8,000 personnel stationed at PSNS. In fact, over 50 sailors are turned away from the facility each day because of space considerations.

In my judgment, this is no way to treat our young men and women serving their country. As we continue to ask those serving in the Armed Forces to do more with less, we must provide them with access to facilities that provide the best possible quality of life. That is what the military constructions subcommittee has attempted to do and I commend the gentlewoman for her efforts. Don't listen to those

who—for purely political purposes—would turn their backs on the quality of life of our soldiers and their families.

Vote with the MILCON mark and vote against the Minge-Royce amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 270, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—158

Allard	Gunderson	Paxon
Archer	Gutierrez	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Gutknecht	Petri
Ballenger	Hall (TX)	Pombo
Barcia	Hancock	Portman
Barr	Hastert	Poshard
Barrett (NE)	Hayworth	Pryce
Barrett (WI)	Herger	Quinn
Barton	Hinchey	Radanovich
Bass	Hobson	Ramstad
Boehner	Hoekstra	Regula
Brewster	Hoke	Reynolds
Browder	Horn	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Inglis	Roberts
Brownback	Istook	Rohrabacher
Bryant (TN)	Jacobs	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Roth
Bunn	Kasich	Roukema
Bunning	Kildee	Royce
Burr	Kim	Salmon
Camp	Kingston	Sanford
Chabot	Klecza	Schaefer
Chapman	Klug	Schiff
Christensen	Kolbe	Schroeder
Chryslers	LaHood	Schumer
Coburn	Largent	Seastrand
Collins (GA)	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Condit	LaTourette	Shadegg
Cooley	Laughlin	Shaw
Cox	Levin	Shays
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Smith (MI)
Creameans	Lincoln	Smith (WA)
Danner	Linder	Souder
Davis	Lipinski	Stearns
Deal	LoBiondo	Stockman
Deutsch	Luther	Stump
Doggett	Manzullo	Talent
Dooley	Martini	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	McCarthy	Thomas
Dornan	McDermott	Thornberry
Dreier	McInnis	Thurman
Duncan	Menendez	Tiahrt
Ehlers	Meyers	Torrice
Ewing	Miller (FL)	Torricelli
Fawell	Minge	Upton
Fields (TX)	Morella	Wamp
Foley	Myrick	Watt (NC)
Frank (MA)	Neal	Weller
Gallegly	Neumann	Williams
Ganske	Ney	Woolsey
Gillmor	Norwood	Wyden
Goodlatte	Nussle	Zeliff
Green	Parker	Zimmer

NOES—270

Abercrombie	Bevill	Buyer
Ackerman	Bilbray	Callahan
Andrews	Bilirakis	Calvert
Bachus	Bishop	Canady
Baesler	Bliley	Cardin
Baker (CA)	Blute	Castle
Baker (LA)	Boehlert	Chambliss
Baldacci	Bonilla	Chenoweth
Bartlett	Bonior	Clay
Bateman	Bono	Clayton
Becerra	Borski	Clement
Beilenson	Boucher	Clinger
Bentsen	Brown (CA)	Clyburn
Bereuter	Brown (FL)	Coble
Berman	Burton	Coleman

Collins (IL)	Hilliard	Payne (VA)
Collins (MI)	Holden	Pelosi
Combest	Hostettler	Peterson (FL)
Conyers	Houghton	Pickett
Costello	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Coyne	Hunter	Porter
Cramer	Hutchinson	Quillen
Crapo	Hyde	Rahall
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Reed
de la Garza	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Riggs
DeLauro	Johnston	Roemer
DeLay	Jones	Rogers
Dellums	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Rush
Dickey	Kelly	Sabo
Dicks	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Sawyer
Dixon	Kennelly	Saxton
Doyle	King	Scarborough
Dunn	Klink	Scott
Durbin	Knollenberg	Serrano
Edwards	LaFalce	Shuster
Ehrlich	Lantos	Siskys
Emerson	Lazio	Skaggs
Engel	Leach	Skeen
English	Lewis (CA)	Skelton
Ensign	Lewis (KY)	Slaughter
Eshoo	Lightfoot	Smith (NJ)
Evans	Livingston	Smith (TX)
Everett	Lofgren	Solomon
Farr	Longley	Spence
Fattah	Lowey	Spratt
Fazio	Lucas	Stark
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Stenholm
Filner	Manton	Stokes
Flake	Markey	Studds
Flanagan	Martinez	Stupak
Foglietta	Mascara	Tanner
Forbes	Matsui	Tate
Ford	McCollum	Tauzin
Fowler	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Fox	McDade	Tejeda
Franks (CT)	McHale	Thompson
Franks (NJ)	McHugh	Thornton
Frelinghuysen	McKeon	Torkildsen
Frisa	McKinney	Torres
Frost	McNulty	Towns
Funderburk	Meehan	Trafficant
Furse	Meek	Tucker
Gejdenson	Metcalf	Velazquez
Gekas	Mfume	Vento
Gephardt	Mica	Vislosky
Geren	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Gibbons	Mineta	Vucanovich
Gilchrest	Mink	Waldholtz
Gilman	Molinar	Walker
Gonzalez	Montgomery	Walsh
Goodling	Moorhead	Ward
Gordon	Murtha	Waters
Goss	Myers	Watts (OK)
Graham	Nadler	Waxman
Greenwood	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Weldon (PA)
Hamilton	Obey	White
Hansen	Olver	Whitfield
Harman	Ortiz	Wicker
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Wilson
Hastings (WA)	Owens	Wise
Hayes	Oxley	Wolf
Hefley	Packard	Wynn
Hefner	Pallone	Yates
Heineman	Pastor	Young (AK)
Hilleary	Payne (NJ)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Jefferson	Moakley	Moran
McIntosh	Mollohan	Rose

□ 1536

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McIntosh for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. OWENS, BUYERS, RUSH, BECERRA, COSTELLO, and MEEHAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. FOLEY, INGLIS of South Carolina, ZIMMER, ZELIFF, LEVIN, DOOLITTLE, and HERGER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORN

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORN: Page 3, line 3, strike "\$588,243,000" and insert "\$489,093,000".

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

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

There has been a lot of discussion about the need for better quality housing for those in the armed services, Mr. Chairman. We heard that Friday. We have heard that today. And those who have argued that are absolutely right.

This amendment involves cutting \$99 million \$150 thousand out of military construction. It is the spending proposed by the Navy to berth three nuclear aircraft carriers at North Island. Ultimately, that is going to cost the taxpayers of the United States \$1 billion.

Most of that money would be better sent on military housing. This spending duplicates facilities that already exist either at Alameda or Long Beach in California or Puget Sound in Washington.

The Navy has requested the \$99 million \$150 thousand for the first phase of this project in fiscal year 1996. The Navy has submitted several substantially different estimates for the total costs of this project. They submitted and had such confusion over the amount that even the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee questioned it. That is why on page 16 of the committee report, the members of the subcommittee noted that they have referred the matter to GAO and hope to resolve it in conference.

I say when the Navy has misled Members of this Chamber, misled its committees, misled GAO, that we should send them a signal that that type of behavior will not be tolerated by the House of Representatives.

The estimate that the Navy submitted to the House Military Construction Subcommittee is \$267.8 million. They submitted a much higher estimate once

the General Accounting Office, the major audit agent of Congress, got into it, \$546.1 million, and they have probably submitted a new estimate in their draft environmental impact statement which, unfortunately, I have not been able to get yet, but it has been filed.

□ 1545

One may question the ethics of submitting one set of cost estimates to the Military Construction Appropriation Subcommittee, another substantially different set of estimates to the Government Accounting Office. A difference of \$278.3 million is significant and raises the question of whether the Navy has used a valid data base or simply obtained their estimate out of thin air. Two admirals have told me privately that the total cost of homeporting two nuclear air carriers at North Island will ultimately be well in excess of \$1 billion. If an environmental suit is filed, and I believe one will be filed—and I want to include after my remarks, Mr. Chairman, a letter from a number of the environmentalists in San Diego, if that is appropriate—then this project will go nowhere for a year, or perhaps more than a year, and, as I say, we should not appropriate the money now.

We should not reward the misleading of the House of Representatives and its Members. The members of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, as I noted, found sufficient reason to question these estimates in their report, and that is why the subcommittee asked the General Accounting Office to conduct a further investigation. I believe that while that investigation is in order, the appropriate action is to strike the funds. That will get the Navy's attention, perhaps it will get the whole Pentagon's attention, because, as I talked to Members, I find similar behavior has come from some of the other services. Bad behavior should not be rewarded. If the Navy ever submits realistic and honest numbers, the House could always reinstate the funding.

So vote for the Horn-Minge-Royce amendment and send a message that this Congress cannot be lied to.

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

My colleagues, this is a fight between two communities on the surface, San Diego and Long Beach, but it is really a lot more than that for everybody here who has some interest in the integrity of the Base Closing Commission and that operation because we have been through this fight before. The gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] has his numbers, San Diego has their numbers, Alameda has their numbers, the Navy has their own analysis, but in the end the Base Closing Commission in which we vested a great deal of trust closed the Naval Station at Long Beach, and I have the report here, the report that over the 20-year period they are going to save about \$2 billion. The Naval Yard at Long Beach, which

is pending closure according to the recommendation for closure, will save the taxpayers an additional \$2 billion. So we are talking about \$4 billion in savings for the taxpayers.

Now the Navy made this decision to close Long Beach, and I am sorry, I feel for the gentleman, I think everybody that was involved in this situation in this program took some shots. We all took some body blows. We lost a naval training center to Illinois. We fought hard for it, Orlando fought hard for it, but with respect to the carriers, that Commission set down in a hard-nosed way and did evaluation of a number of areas. They did evaluation with respect to mission, and mission capability of the service was the most important thing. They said that having the aircraft replacement and repair yard right next to the carriers in San Diego was important because we have about 110 planes a year that have to be lifted by crane literally, damaged planes, off the carriers and repaired at the facility right there in North Island. They said the idea that we had the hospital at San Diego was good for families; that was important to them. They said that having the carrier training range right off San Diego, where cargo ships cannot go and impede naval operations, was important to have that colocation.

So, for all those reasons BRACC made a decision to close Long Beach.

I say to my colleagues, "Don't involve yourself in an amendment that opens up the BRACC process. That is bad news for this House. Let's keep that naval station at Long Beach closed, let's keep the naval hospital closed, and let's keep this thing on track."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have asked the Secretary of the Navy to reaffirm the decision to homeport the nuclear carriers at North Island and would like to share his response. He states many other things in this letter, but the most important thing he says:

The total estimated construction and dredging costs to enable NAS North Island to homeport up to three NIMITZ class carriers is \$268 million. This plan is completely on track to support the arrival of the first NIMITZ class carrier in August 1998. To stay on track, the approval of the Berthing Wharf and Controlled Industrial Facility projects in the FY 1996 budget is essential.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to my good colleague from San Diego. The gentleman has made a very interesting presentation. The only thing is it has nothing to do with this issue. This is not a BRACC [Base Realignment and Closure Commission] issue. The Navy says it is not a BRACC issue. Who did they say it to? They said

it to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission.

What this is is a spending issue, pure and simple. What this is is the honesty of the numbers. That is why the subcommittee has asked the Government Accounting Office to go after that. I asked them several months ago to go after it. What happened? They were stonewalled. I was stonewalled, the Comptroller General of the United States was stonewalled. They should have subpoenaed the report. They did not. They have to live with these people because, if they get too tough on them, they will not get the information the next time they are around, and it is nothing to do with BRACC. It has simply honesty of numbers, and I ask, "What do you tell the House of Representatives and its subcommittees as well as its Members?"

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a little time for myself, as much time as I may consume, and ask the gentleman to respond briefly. I ask, If this isn't a BRACC issue, and you've already closed the naval station at Long Beach, and the shipyard closure is pending, what are you going to do with these carriers if you send them back up to Long Beach?

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

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

Mr. HORN. No. 1, all of the facilities that were at the naval station in essence are mothballed. They have not been disposed of yet. There is a wharf there, there is an officers club, there is housing, there is a fire department, and the industrial facilities. Now—

Mr. HUNTER. Reclaiming my time—reclaiming my time, and I would just conclude, the gentleman obviously is saying, You're going to have to build a naval base. You can't have 15,000 people; that's three carriers' worth, and their dependents, and not have a naval base.

So the gentleman is either going to have to reopen the Long Beach Naval Station—I say to the gentleman, You can't homeport these at the Dairy Queen; you're going to have to reopen the Long Beach Naval Station, or you're going to have to keep the shipyard open, and that's what your group, Save our Shipyards, is trying to do, and I commend them for it. It is very creative, but it is going to blow away the integrity of the BRACC process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I would not normally involve myself in a dispute between two good friends, but in this case this is really all of our business.

I have here the base realignment closure report from 1991, and it says quite clearly, "Recommendation: Close

Naval Station Long Beach and transfer the ships—reassign ships to other specific fleet home ports," but what the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is trying to do here is defund the other homeport so there is no place for the ships to go so they stay in his homeport. That is pretty neat if it can be done, but I think it is the wrong thing to do.

Second, a four star general said to me recently, "Do us one favor. Don't make any changes in what BRACC has already done. People who wear the uniform deserve the right to have some stability in the force," and this would create, I believe, instability.

Third, let me make a point that, if we move this concept to the East Coast where I live, Philadelphia Shipyard has been closed, other east port shipyards are open. I ask, Why don't ROB ANDREWS, CURT WELDON, and TOM FOGLETTA and JIM SAXTON just get together and introduce a bill to defund them? That is not a logical way for us to proceed. So I oppose the amendment, and I ask others to join me.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I need to make a point here.

No. 1, no one is talking about reopening the Long Beach Naval Station. I said housing is there; in fact 27,000 houses exist in noncrime areas to house the people. San Diego is a couple of years behind in housing. But that is not the point. Those carriers could, A, stay at Alameda; B, go to Puget Sound; they could go to Long Beach; they could go to Pearl Harbor; they could go anywhere they want. What is at stake here is the amount of money to suddenly rebuild the facilities that are at Alameda, build the facilities that are at Puget Sound, build the facilities that were closed at Long Beach. That is what is at stake, and it is the honesty of the numbers that are at stake.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, Members, I would hope that we would resist this amendment. All carriers have to have some place to go. I say, If you are going to close, as the BRACC commission has recommended, Long Beach Naval Shipyard, then close Long Beach Naval Station. To defund the places to which those carriers have to be set on the Pacific Coast would, I think, represent bad policy, especially if its aim or underpinning of it is to undo legislatively the BRACC process.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, this facility is in my district. It also happens to be the Navy base where I was born. But let me just say that my colleague talks about this whole process. It is the whole process of the BRACC that says the most cost-effective way of defending our Nation was to take a certain strategy. It did not fit in with Long

Beach. I understand that, but I do have to call attention to my colleague from California that the co-called environmentalists that he referred to happened to be the same people who were litigating right now to stop us from treating sewage from a foreign country that is polluting this area, too.

So I say to my colleagues, "Please don't refer to these people as environmentalists. They think of themselves as that. This whole issue is one of those ugly little games that gets played, and I hope we don't allow certain pressure groups to get involved in that. I'm asking you to take a look at the fact that BRACC process came down, my district was hurt by the loss of the naval training facility, but it also, in that work, was saying that the consolidation of these facilities in one area will save the United States' people money, and I think that is a critical part about this when we talk about the dredging, the improvements and everything else that has gone on in San Diego. It will continue to do it regardless of this."

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

Let me just say in answer to my friend from San Diego that what we are talking about here is the fact that the station is not being reopened, the facilities are available on the west coast, and the billion dollar boondoggle that we will ultimately have in San Diego means not only that 70 percent of the Pacific surface fleet is there, but most of the carriers will be there, and what a wonderful target for terrorists, for other nations, whatever, and it just seems to me that the Navy ought to be rethinking its basic strategy anyhow. In addition, when we think of the earthquake fault and all the rest that they are going to have to build this on, I do not think the project will ever be done. But if Congress wants to spend that money on something other than military housing, I cannot prevent a majority from doing it.

I would just say we would more wisely spend the money on military housing throughout the world and throughout this country so that our sailors, our air personnel and our military would have decent housing while they serve their Nation.

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

□ 1600

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes 45 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the top gun.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I have operated out of all of these bases, and I resent, and I say I resent the gentleman from California establishing and saying that the Navy is pulling these figures out of the air. Evidently the GAO is wrong, the Navy is wrong, the Taxpayers Union is wrong, the committee is wrong, the Secretary of Defense is wrong, and even the President that asked for these

dollars is wrong. He sets himself up. Someone that has spent their life staying out of the military, now sets himself up as the sole executor of what is right for the Navy.

Well, it is flat wrong. You talk about billions of dollars. We save \$2 billion by closing Long Beach. You say it has nothing to do with that. Only a fool would believe that, to the gentleman of California. We saved not only billions of dollars there, when you send a sailor out to sea, which we have done since World War II, out of San Diego, we have three carriers ported there right now. You talk about environmentalists? Give me a break. We have carriers established there. We will in the future.

We need to take a look at what it takes to reduplicate. We have one of the most modern hospitals, base housing, 100 training facilities, all of the fire-fighting facilities. Why do you think they call it a megaport? That is Oceania should never have closed down, because it is the megaport on the east coast. Only a fool would want to change and deal with that. That is why every single committee, this committee and all the way down from the Secretary of the Navy and the President say this is a foolhardy amendment.

I take a look at what we have gone through in the past with looking at base closures. Every base closure has said, and this is the final one that says, "Long Beach needs to close." Why? Because their cost for repairing a ship is three times what it is at any other facility. It is gone. It is history. And yet I applaud the gentleman for trying to save it. He says this has nothing to do with that. It is absolutely wrong, and it is not the fact.

Let me quote from the 1993 base closure commission report. Substantial military construction is occurring at Everett, North Island to replace a portion of nuclear carrier berthing capacity that exists in Alameda. These MILCON projects are being accomplished separate from the base closure process ultimately result in the Navy's ability to home port aircraft carriers at a reduced cost.

Now, the gentleman wants to increase and incur \$2 billion from the closure of Long Beach. He also wants another \$4 or \$5 billion to duplicate all of these training facilities, hospitals and everything else. When he says he wants to save, that is a liberal's way of saying "I want to spend more money."

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman again tries to make an issue out of the BRACC process. The issue is exactly what the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations found. The numbers are soft. They cannot get a straight answer. So instead of taking the money out, they said "Well, we have referred it to GAO, let us work it out in conference."

I am saying based on my experience, when Members of this House are

stonewalled by the Navy, not given the accurate numbers, they sit on them until they finally feel they have to give some number, and that is exactly what has happened. I am saying the way you deal with that is not go advocating parochial pork in your district. You deal with it by saying "look, this project is going nowhere right now, once the lawsuits get done on the environment alone." Why not take the money out, get their attention, and let us get them serious, to submit the numbers to the Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations that could be put in a supplemental, that could be put any number of places.

But the fact is what the gentleman says about the Long Beach Naval Shipyard is just dead wrong. All you have to do is look at which shipyard gave money back to the Treasury of the United States and the Navy over the last several years. The only one was the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Now, I do find it ironic, and I think the taxpayers will find it ironic, that suddenly it appears on the list of the Navy, when it has never been there before, ranked a strong third as a shipyard, with only Puget Sound and Norfolk ahead of it.

But that is not the issue. The issue is lousy numbers, misleading the Congress, misleading GAO. I think the only way you teach better behavior of spoiled little children is to take something away from them for a while.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been refighting BRACC. For mission effectiveness, for the men and women in uniform, for the taxpayers saving \$4 billion under the base that has already been closed at Long Beach and the base to be closed at Long Beach, and for the integrity of the base closing process, vote against this amendment.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, again, this has nothing to do with BRACC. We have heard a lot of figures. All that happened before I was a Member of the House 2 years ago. That is the closing of the Long Beach naval station. No one can retrieve that. What we can do is make economies where we see them, and if we can get above the parochialism of all of our districts, we will say when have you three aircraft carriers that need to be berthed somewhere, look at Puget Sound, keep them at Alameda, put them in San Diego, put them in Long Beach. But when you do that, give the Congress some honest figures of what it is going to cost. And if you are closing a naval shipyard at Long Beach with one hand, and secretly opening enough of comparable facilities in San Diego with another, I would say the Navy is not coming before this body with clean hands.

I would ask the Congress to strike this money, just as the Subcommittee

on Military Construction Appropriations has already noted, they got lousy numbers out of the Navy, and they want to know what the story is. The difference is, they would like to know by conference;

I am saying let us get it out on the floor.

I include for the RECORD the following information:

June 19, 1995.

Chairman ALAN J. DIXON,  
*Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission, Arlington, VA.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN DIXON: We read in the June 15, 1995 San Diego Union Tribune that issues related to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) regarding the CVN Homeporting in San Diego had been discussed by BRAC members. We are in the process of commenting on the DEIS and wanted to share with you some of our concerns regarding this document.

These concerns are shared by the undersigned organizations. It is our analysis that the DEIS is significantly deficient in a number of areas which are listed below and in the attachment. If the issues raised below are not fully resolved and corrected in the final DEIS, it is our belief that the DEIS will be in direct violation of NEPA.

The deficiencies in the DEIS are numerous and significant. For the sake of brevity, we have listed the major problematic areas below with more specific problems attached. Our complete comment letter will be available on June 26, 1995, the date of closure of public comment. We will be happy to send you the complete list of deficiencies and problems in more detail at that time.

Our concerns are as follows:

1. *Inadequate analysis of alternatives*

The DEIS lacks an adequate examination of alternatives and there are several that are possible. The Code of Federal Regulations states that agencies shall: "(a) Rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated.

(b) Devote substantial treatment to each alternative considered in detail including the proposed action so that reviewers may evaluate their comparative merits.

(c) Include reasonable alternatives not within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

There are a number of alternatives that are viable for the homeporting project. None of these were evaluated or even mentioned in the DEIS. This is a significant failing of this document.

A decisionmaker must explore alternatives sufficiently to "sharply define the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among options by the decisionmaker and the public." 40 C.F.R. §1502.14. Because of the absence of a satisfactory evaluation of alternatives, the Navy has failed in its duty to foster informed decision-making and public participation in the NEPA process. This DEIS ignores reasonable, viable alternatives and therefore is inadequate.

2. *The DEIS does not examine the full impacts of the entire project*

The DEIS does not examine the impacts of 3 CVNs even though it stated, in a number of Navy documents and memos in our possession, that 3 CVNs will be homeported here. In addition, the number of and impacts from additional transient CVNs is not adequately discussed in the DEIS. The DEIS is inadequate in that all aspects of the proposed project are not analyzed. For example, the DEIS does not discuss the extent to which

support ships for the homeported CVN's will also be homeported in San Diego. NEPA requires that, [p]roposals or parts of proposals which are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of action shall be evaluated in a single impact statement." 40 C.F.R. §1502.4(a). Thus, the EIS must analyze *all* impacts of the homeporting of three CVNs in San Diego, not just those associated with the first CVN.

### 3. DEIS lacks mitigation for environmental impacts of dredging

The DEIS cites the intent to dredge 9 million cubic yards of bay bottom. No mitigations are offered for the impacts of the dredging, attendant impacts on fish and wildlife and impacts on those who consume the fish. Council on Environmental Quality regulations require every EIS to include a discussion of means to mitigate adverse environmental impacts. 40 C.F.R. §1502.16(h). In fact, the adequacy of an EIS rests upon the completeness of the mitigation plan. *ONRC v. Marsh*, 832 F.2d 1489, 1493 (9th Cir. 1987).

Because the EIS lacks a detailed description of mitigation measures for the impacts of dredging and an analysis of their effectiveness, the Navy fails to meet its criteria obligation of fostering informed decision-making and informed public participation. *State of California v. Block*, 690 F.2d 753, 767 (9th Cir. 1982).

Thank you for your interest in the environmental process as it relates to the CVN Homeporting project.

Sincerely,

LAURA HUNTER,  
San Diego Military  
Toxics Campaign;

Z KRIPKE,  
Physicians for Social  
Responsibility;

ROY LATAS,  
Chairperson, San  
Diego County  
Chapter Surfrider  
Foundation;

CAROL JAHNKOW,  
San Diego Peace Re-  
source Center;

LORRAINE DEMI,  
Committee Opposed  
to Militarism and  
the Draft;

JOSÉ BRAVO,  
Southwest Network  
for Economic and  
Environmental  
Justice.

ATTACHMENT #1 TO JUNE 16, 1995 LETTER TO  
CHAIRMAN DIXON OF THE BASE REALIGNMENT  
AND CLOSURE COMMISSION

Additional issues and concerns that will be raised in the June 26, 1995 from the San Diego Military Toxics Campaign letter to the DEIS include:

DEIS does not address the cumulative effects of homeporting the 3 CVNs to the effects of the already homeported nuclear-powered submarines at Ballast Point.

DEIS does not adequately assess the transportation routes, holding areas, and ultimate

disposal of hazardous and radiological waste. Designations of ultimate disposal sites are not made nor are arrangements made for permanent storage on site.

DEIS grossly underestimates the effects of the presence of an active fault line in the construction area.

DEIS proposes an inadequately designed confined disposal facility for containing toxic material in a marine environment.

DEIS does not include Health Risk Assessments to assess the increases in cancer risk and acute and chronic health hazard indices from homeporting of any CVNs.

The emergency plan for a major reactor accident discussed in the EIS is completely unworkable, requiring barging of the carrier only at a certain high tides.

The current project description appears to allow sediment that failed toxicity screening tests to be placed on the beaches. There is a lack of adequate metals chemistry testing done on turning basin material intended for beach disposal.

DEIS does not accurately reflect and underestimates environmental justice issues.

The EIS lacks information on and mitigation for the introduction of the major amount of radiological work that will be conducted as part of the servicing of the nuclear carriers.

While citing alleged safety of nuclear-powered vessels, provides neither adequate data regarding performance records of naval nuclear reactors so that an independent evaluation may be made, nor sufficient information regarding the nature of the reactors and the types of radioactive nuclides that might be released in the event of an accident.

Project description fails to include channel widening requests from the San Diego Harbor Safety Committee even though the recommendations were made to improve safety with existing traffic in the Bay. The homeporting of 3 CVNs would increase risk and traffic in San Diego Bay.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Horn amendment to cut \$99 million in wasteful, duplicative spending for Navy facilities in San Diego that already exist in Long Beach, CA. This amendment is much more important than just saving \$99 million. The \$99 million is just the first year downpayment of what is going to be close to \$1 billion in spending before the Navy is through.

This is the key vote on saving taxpayers money. If this money is appropriated there will be hundreds of millions to follow; none of which is needed.

In addition to saving money the Horn amendment also saves the environment. At the appropriate time during debate in the House I will ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter signed by the Surfrider Foundation of San Diego County and five other organizations that raises critical questions about the environment effects of this proposed \$1 billion in construction.

At the very least I urge my colleagues to vote to delete these funds from this year's bill

to allow full consideration of the impact on the environment of these massive construction projects. Vote "yes" on the Horn amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 137, noes 294, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No 395]

#### AYES—137

Allard	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Andrews	Hayworth	Obey
Baesler	Hinchee	Orton
Barcia	Hoekstra	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Horn	Pastor
Becerra	Houghton	Payne (NJ)
Bereuter	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Berman	Jacobs	Petri
Brown (OH)	Johnson (SD)	Rahall
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rangel
Camp	Kennedy (MA)	Reynolds
Chapman	Kennelly	Rivers
Clay	Kildee	Roemer
Clayton	Kim	Rohrabacher
Clinger	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (IL)	Kleczka	Roth
Collins (MI)	Klug	Roybal-Allard
Costello	LaHood	Royce
Coyne	Lantos	Rush
Danner	Lazio	Sanders
Davis	Leach	Schroeder
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Dixon	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Dooley	Maloney	Serrano
Dornan	Manzullo	Shays
Duncan	Markey	Smith (MI)
Durbin	Martinez	Souder
Ehlers	Martini	Stark
Engel	McCarthy	Stokes
Eshoo	McCollum	Studds
Farr	McDermott	Tanner
Fawell	McKinney	Torres
Fazio	Meehan	Torricelli
Fields (LA)	Meek	Towns
Foley	Menendez	Tucker
Ford	Miller (CA)	Upton
Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Vento
Franks (NJ)	Mineta	Waters
Furse	Minge	Watt (NC)
Ganske	Mink	Waxman
Gonzalez	Moorhead	Williams
Gordon	Moran	Wise
Green	Morella	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Nadler	Wyden
Gutknecht	Neal	Yates
Harman	Nussle	

#### NOES—294

Abercrombie	Baker (LA)	Barton
Ackerman	Baldacci	Bass
Archer	Ballenger	Bateman
Armey	Barr	Beilenson
Bachus	Barrett (NE)	Bentsen
Baker (CA)	Bartlett	Bevill

Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop  
 Bliley  
 Blute  
 Boehlert  
 Boehner  
 Bonilla  
 Bonior  
 Bono  
 Borski  
 Boucher  
 Brewster  
 Browder  
 Brown (CA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownback  
 Bryant (TN)  
 Bunn  
 Bunning  
 Burr  
 Burton  
 Buyer  
 Callahan  
 Calvert  
 Canady  
 Cardin  
 Castle  
 Chabot  
 Chambliss  
 Chenoweth  
 Christensen  
 Chrysler  
 Clement  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Coburn  
 Coleman  
 Collins (GA)  
 Combest  
 Condit  
 Conyers  
 Cooley  
 Cox  
 Cramer  
 Crane  
 Crapo  
 Cremeans  
 Cubin  
 Cunningham  
 de la Garza  
 Deal  
 DeFazio  
 DeLauro  
 DeLay  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dickey  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Dunn  
 Edwards  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 English  
 Ensign  
 Evans  
 Everett  
 Ewing  
 Fattah  
 Fields (TX)  
 Filner  
 Flake  
 Flanagan  
 Foglietta  
 Forbes  
 Fowler

Fox  
 Franks (CT)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frisa  
 Frost  
 Funderburk  
 Gallegly  
 Gejdenson  
 Gekas  
 Gephardt  
 Geren  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Goodlatte  
 Goodling  
 Goss  
 Graham  
 Greenwood  
 Gunderson  
 Hall (OH)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hamilton  
 Hancock  
 Hansen  
 Hastert  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Hefley  
 Hefner  
 Heineman  
 Herger  
 Hilleary  
 Hilliard  
 Hobson  
 Hoke  
 Holden  
 Hostettler  
 Hoyer  
 Hunter  
 Hutchinson  
 Hyde  
 Inglis  
 Istook  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kasich  
 Kelly  
 Kennedy (RI)  
 King  
 Klink  
 Knollenberg  
 Kolbe  
 LaFalce  
 Largent  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Laughlin  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Lightfoot  
 Lincoln  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 Livingston  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren  
 Longley  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Manton  
 Mascara  
 Matsui  
 McCrery  
 McDade

McHale  
 McHugh  
 McInnis  
 McIntosh  
 McKeon  
 McNulty  
 Metcalf  
 Meyers  
 Mfume  
 Mica  
 Molinari  
 Mollohan  
 Montgomery  
 Murtha  
 Myers  
 Myrick  
 Nethercutt  
 Neumann  
 Ney  
 Norwood  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Oxley  
 Packard  
 Pallone  
 Parker  
 Paxon  
 Payne (VA)  
 Peterson (FL)  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Pickett  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Poshard  
 Pryce  
 Quillen  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Ramstad  
 Reed  
 Regula  
 Richardson  
 Riggs  
 Roberts  
 Rogers  
 Rose  
 Roukema  
 Sabo  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Scarborough  
 Schaefer  
 Schiff  
 Scott  
 Seastrand  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shuster  
 Sisisky  
 Skaggs  
 Skee  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Solomon  
 Spence  
 Spratt  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Stockman  
 Stump  
 Stupak  
 Talent  
 Tate  
 Tauzin

Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Tejeda  
 Thomas  
 Thompson  
 Thornberry  
 Thornton  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Torkildsen  
 Traficant  
 Velazquez  
 Vislosky  
 Volkmer  
 Vucanovich  
 Waldholtz  
 Walker  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Ward  
 Watts (OK)  
 Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 White  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson  
 Wolf  
 Wynn  
 Young (FL)  
 Zeliff  
 Zimmer

NOT VOTING—3

Jefferson Moakley Young (AK)

□ 1628

Messrs. FOGLIETTA, HILLIARD, and CHRISTENSEN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MOORHEAD changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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, \$578,841,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$49,021,000 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 Committee 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, \$728,332,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *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 or family housing 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 \$68,837,000 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, \$72,537,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

Mr. GUTIERREZ. 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. Gutierrez: On page 5, line 4, strike "\$72,537,000", and insert "\$69,914,000".

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes or less, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to offer an amendment today that helps the American taxpayer get some relief.

My amendment is simple.

It saves the American taxpayer \$2.6 million by eliminating funding for construction of a new outdoor firing range for the National Guard in Tennessee.

Why is this project a perfect example of congressional pork?

Because an indoor firing range already exists at the very same site.

And because the Army National Guard did not request the funding.

And because the Department of Defense did not even request the funding.

In fact, no one in the Defense Department has argued that this project is essential for reasons of national security. They did not put it in their request.

This unneeded project is a congressional add-on.



Now, a congressional add-on doesn't mean that the 435 Members of this body are going to pass the hat and take up a collection of \$2.6 million among ourselves to fund this program.

A congressional add-on is a bureaucratic way of saying that a bunch of politicians are ignoring the military request, who say we do not need this facility, and are sticking the American taxpayer with a bill for almost 3 million bucks.

In fact the only thing this bill is adding on is adding on the fiscal irresponsibility of the U.S. Congress and the unfair burden to working Americans.

It is certainly not adding to our national security.

Let me repeat and make clear—this project was not in the Department of Defense budget request for military installations.

That means that the people who plan and manage our defense budget have made a clear decision—this project is not a priority.

It is not needed.

Now, people who defend this pork might say, "Well, construction has already begun—what's another 3 million to finish it?" Or, "The indoor firing range isn't exactly perfect—it doesn't precisely meet our needs."

Well, in the desperate budget situation our Nation is facing, we cannot always precisely meet our needs.

We need to make decisions about priorities.

We make them every day.

In fact, the majority in this house has decided we can't precisely meet our Nation's needs for more police officers on our streets, or more job-training programs for our workers, or more Head Start for our kids or protecting Medicare for our seniors.

But, they want to argue today, we can find \$3 million for a firing range the Defense Department doesn't want.

It is a question of priorities.

Today, let us listen to the priorities of the Department of Defense.

Their priorities are clear.

A brand new, outdoor firing range, in the same location where an indoor range already exists is not a priority to our Nation's military leaders. They made it clear in their budget request.

In fact, when we start tampering with the budget request of experts, we risk funding for programs that are in our Nation's vital national security interests.

A "yes" vote on this amendment simply says we are listening to the experts and standing up against pork. A "yes" vote says that we are listening to our constituents and putting the best interests of the American taxpayer first.

A "no" vote says that despite all the rhetoric, despite all the promises, despite the American voters' overwhelming desire to have us change business as usual inside the beltway—the pork is still sizzling.

Take the pork out of the frying pan today, please vote to support this important amendment.

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

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

(Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Gutierrez amendment.

The defense bill we passed last week was a much needed first step toward restoring military readiness.

Nowhere is readiness more important than for the numerous State National Guards who serve this country.

The National Guard represents over half of America's military force.

I believe that the policies set forth by this Congress should certainly reflect the crucial importance of the National Guard for the security needs of this country.

But the Gutierrez amendment certainly does not reflect that belief, because it would eliminate a much needed training site located at Tullahoma, TN.

This amendment could effectively serve to damage and undermine the effectiveness and readiness of the Tennessee Army National Guard and the U.S. Armed Forces.

Mr. Chairman, the Tennessee National Guard, the U.S. military, and the millions of Americans who depend on both of them for protecting our interests at home and abroad need the training site at Tullahoma.

The Tullahoma facility certainly would serve a legitimate and strategic role for America's security interests. It would provide tough and realistic training conditions for our troops.

This facility would support the training of the 278th Armored Cavalry Regi-

ment—one of only 15 regiments which has been designated as an enhanced readiness brigade.

I might add that an enhanced readiness brigade is the highest level of readiness for deployment.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Tullahoma site would serve to train the 196th Field Artillery Brigade—one of only two National Guard artillery brigades that served in the gulf war.

And it would be the training site for several other important troops and brigades as well.

Mr. Chairman, it is of vital importance that the soldiers of the Tennessee Army National Guard are provided with the proper training to allow them to carry out their mission.

When we turn to the Guard, it is with the understanding that they are properly trained and prepared to confront whatever the task at hand may be in a ready manner.

Mr. Chairman, to my fellow colleagues, I say let us not compromise military readiness and the security needs of America for the sake of politics.

Vote against the Gutierrez amendment.

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

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment lowers the appropriation in the Army National Guard portion of the bill from \$72,537,000 to \$69,914,000. This is clearly targeted at a vital project to maintain the readiness of the Army National Guard.

This portion of the military construction budget goes to a critical requirement for a modified record fire range. This project is a priority with the Army National Guard up and down the chain of command. This range will have a direct positive impact on readiness.

The National Guard has a proud tradition of service to the country. And I know I do not need to remind you of the important role the National Guard plays in our overall defense strategy. The soldiers of the National Guard must be trained to meet the mobilization mission for deployment in support of the U.S. Army. This range will assist in the readiness required to meet the individual, and collective, range training to meet the mobilization mission.

This site will support the training of the 278th Armored Cavalry Regiment,

one of only 15 scheduled for designation as an Enhanced Readiness Brigade, which is the highest readiness level for deployment. With the significant cut in force structure that has occurred in recent years, the capability and competence of the National Guard are more important than ever to maintain our edge.

The modified record fire range is not a glamour project. Ask anyone who has ever fired on one. It is a challenging, realistic battle training requirement. To put it plain and simple, it is the kind of training our soldiers need to fight and win wars. Please vote to support our Army National Guard and our Nation's military readiness by voting not on the Gutierrez amendment.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT].

I would ask the gentleman, what is the problem with the existing indoor firing range? How old is it and what is the problem? What is the justification, just for my information?

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, this is an outdoor training range that artillery can be used on that provides a realistic battlefield type situation. If we expect our citizens to be ready on a moment's notice to go to war, I think they deserve the same type of training that our citizens that are in the Armed Forces on active duty have, because they get this kind of training all the time.

I think it is just something that the men and women in the Guard and the Reserve, for that matter, deserve. From my participation in Desert Storm, I know this is the type of training we had.

Mr. HEFNER. My question, Mr. Chairman, is what is the status, and how old is the existing firing range. The firing range in Tullahoma, TN, is an indoor firing range, is that correct?

Mr. HILLEARY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, it is not adequate and will not provide the training. I am not sure how old it is, but it would not provide the type of training, as well as the type of readiness realistic training this would provide.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, how much territory will this new firing range take? How much property? Is it like 10, 20, 30 acres? The gentleman says they could use artillery. What artillery does the National Guard use?

Mr. HILLEARY. I am not exactly sure how many acres it would take, but it would not be that many, I do not believe.

Mr. HEFNER. The gentleman does not know how large an area this would encompass?

Mr. HILLEARY. No, sir, I do not.

Mr. HEFNER. Will it be constructed on existing property that belongs to the Tennessee State National Guard?

Mr. HILLEARY. It would be constructed on property already owned by the Department of Defense, yes, sir.

Mr. HEFNER. The Department of Defense?

Mr. HILLEARY. That is my understanding. That is correct, yes.

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

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is, as the gentleman has indicated, an add on. It is an add on that was not requested by the President, but for crying out loud, we said in the Contract With America that the President is wrong in the level with which he wants to cut back the defense of this country, and that we were going to make some changes in that. We tried to make some changes, both in the authorization bill and now in the appropriation bill, to correct some of the things.

Yes, some of the things that are in here are not things the President requested, but of the add ons, over 70 percent of them are things just like Members see here, foundations in family housing being held up by jacks, and screens and doors coming off of windows. Over 70 percent are those kinds of things.

Mr. Chairman, if it was something that are not a quality of life or housing type of thing, we had to be absolutely, thoroughly convinced it was meaningful and significant, and that they could do it and it was on their list of high priorities, even though they did not ask it.

This was one of those projects. It was on their list of priorities. They had not requested it because they simply were not allowed by the orders they had from above to request everything on

their priority list, but it was on their list of priorities. They convinced us that it is something that they very badly needed for readiness, and we supported it and felt very good about supporting it.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members to vote against this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I reserve the right to close.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody is discussing the importance of the National Guard. I do not think that anybody can truthfully argue that the military preparedness of the Nation is on the line because of a firing range. We did take out a *Sea Wolf* submarine. I do not know about military preparedness and the defense of our Nation, a firing range in Tennessee and *Sea Wolf* submarine. I think I want the *Sea Wolf* submarine defending me if we are going to start looking at priorities in terms of this Nation and its defense.

Let me just reiterate, and I do not want to get into an argument about the President, it is always easy to bring him into a debate and the argument, it is as though all of our military staff, the generals, the Colonels, all of those people who give everything they can in defense of this Nation, just put their hands up in the air and said "The President did not allow us to include this essential piece of military preparedness, so we are just going to follow what he says, in spite of what is good for our troops."

Just a bunch of weaklings we have in our military is what we are supposed to believe, if that argument is supposed to be true. I do not believe that about the military in this Nation. I think if they thought this was an issue that was important, they would have included it there. I think it speaks less of them to think anything else of the military leadership of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, Members say it is a priority, but the fact is if it was such a priority, I just return, why did they not request the funding for this priority? We all can argue about priorities all day long. However, the priorities should have come from the Department of Defense, and they have already said it-is not a priority.

I look at page 22 of the military construction appropriations bill of 1996,

and it seems as though there were a lot of priorities in a lot of different districts.

□ 1645

It says Component, Army National Guard, the request was for \$18,480,000. Well, someone found a whole bunch of more priorities, all the way to \$72,537,000. That is a \$54 million jump in priorities.

I just think that we have to look at what our priorities are. It was not requested. The fact remains that there is an indoor facility right there at that National Guard where they can get trained. The money was not asked for. I think the reason a lot of people do not even know where the land is, where all of the stuff is at, is because it was put in late in the process.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close. If the gentleman has anything further, he should use his time.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, let me just say, we all have priorities. If we want to talk about cuts, we have seen the kind of draconian cuts that we have had here in this Congress that are going to cause pain. Not educating the child is going to cause pain in the Head Start Program, a 3-year-old child. Cutting out a WIC program is going to cause pain. A senior citizen who may not be able to get proper medical attention because you increased their deductible under a Medicare reform program and cuts in Medicare are going to cause pain.

I think what we have to do is look at this pain and say to ourselves, let's look at that compared to the \$2.6 million that is here. The fact is, it is not a priority. The fact is, that we cut and have cut here in this Congress.

I think that the American taxpayers deserve \$2.6 million. It was not asked for by the military. They did not say it was a priority. Someone added it on. Unless we are going to pass the hat in this place and the 435 Members are going to pony up for the \$2.6 million, then let's give the taxpayers a little bit of relief.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say I am a little surprised that the gentleman does not seem to understand the chain of command in the military. It is not because they are sniveling cowards or they are not courageous. They fight like crazy for what they think is important over there inside the building. But they have bosses all the way up to the President of the United States.

If the President of the United States says this is the level and it does not come out of the building, then they cannot request it, even if it is a high priority. It has to do with the chain of command.

That is why you get these kinds of situations, high priorities, not requested, because they have limitations put on them by the boss.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, is recognized for closure.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This project for the Army National Guard will provide a standard 10-lane record firing range, designed for individual weapons proficiency and qualification. Currently there is no such range in the State of Tennessee to support the pre-mobilization training and annual individual weapons qualification requirements for 14,340 soldiers.

Without this project, day-to-day training objectives will be delayed, and this will increase the time that is required to meet basic qualifications when Guardsmen are called to active duty.

The committee has been notified that this project has project has been submitted within the Department on three separate occasions, only to be deferred due to budget constraint.

I know of no project that is more basic to the readiness of the Army National Guard than a project to provide for firing individual weapons at targets comparable to battlefield ranges, and to develop speed and accuracy in target engagement in a realistic environment.

The Army National Guard reports that this project is mission-essential, that it is 65-percent designed, that the estimate contract award date is May of 1996, and that construction can begin in fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves our support.

I ask for your vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 216, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—214

Abercrombie	Barcia	Berman
Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Boehlert
Allard	Barton	Bonior
Andrews	Bass	Borski
Baessler	Becerra	Browder
Baldacci	Beilenson	Brown (CA)
Ballenger	Bentsen	Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Brownback	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Bryant (TX)	Hilliard	Pelosi
Bunn	Hinchee	Peterson (FL)
Camp	Hoekstra	Petri
Cardin	Holden	Portman
Chabot	Horn	Poshard
Chapman	Hoyer	Rahall
Christensen	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Chrysler	Inglis	Rangel
Clay	Istook	Reed
Clayton	Jackson-Lee	Regula
Clyburn	Jacobs	Reynolds
Coburn	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Coleman	Johnson, E.B.	Rivers
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Roemer
Collins (MI)	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Condit	Kaptur	Rose
Cooley	Kasich	Roth
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Royce
Danner	Kennelly	Rush
Davis	Kildee	Sabo
de la Garza	Klecicka	Sanders
DeFazio	Klug	Sanford
DeLauro	LaFalce	Sawyer
Dellums	Lantos	Schroeder
Deutsch	Largent	Schumer
Dickey	Leach	Scott
Dicks	Levin	Sensenbrenner
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Dixon	Lipinski	Shadegg
Doggett	Lofgren	Shays
Dooley	Lowe	Skaggs
Doyle	Luther	Slaughter
Durbin	Maloney	Smith (MI)
Edwards	Manton	Smith (WA)
Ehlers	Markey	Souder
Engel	Martinez	Spratt
Ensign	Martini	Stark
Eshoo	Matsui	Stokes
Evans	McCarthy	Studds
Farr	McDermott	Thompson
Fattah	McIntosh	Thurman
Fazio	McKinney	Torres
Fields (LA)	Meehan	Torricelli
Filner	Meek	Towns
Flake	Menendez	Tucker
Foglietta	Mfume	Upton
Ford	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Vento
Furse	Minge	Visclosky
Ganske	Mink	Volkmer
Gejdenson	Moran	Ward
Gephardt	Morella	Waters
Geren	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Gibbons	Neal	Waxman
Gilchrest	Neumann	Whitfield
Gonzalez	Ney	Williams
Green	Nussle	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Wyden
Hall (OH)	Obey	Wynn
Hall (TX)	Olver	Zimmer
Hamilton	Orton	
Harman	Owens	

NOES—216

Archer	Clement	Fox
Armey	Clinger	Franks (CT)
Bachus	Coble	Franks (NJ)
Baker (CA)	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Baker (LA)	Combest	Frisa
Barr	Conyers	Frost
Barrett (NE)	Cox	Funderburk
Bartlett	Cramer	Gallely
Bateman	Crane	Gekas
Bereuter	Crapo	Gillmor
Bevill	Cremeans	Gilman
Bilbray	Cubin	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Goodling
Bishop	Deal	Gordon
Bliley	DeLay	Goss
Blute	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Boehner	Doolittle	Greenwood
Bonilla	Dornan	Gunderson
Bono	Dreier	Gutknecht
Boucher	Duncan	Hancock
Brewster	Dunn	Hansen
Bryant (TN)	Ehrlich	Hastert
Bunning	Emerson	Hastings (WA)
Burr	English	Hayes
Burton	Everett	Hayworth
Buyer	Ewing	Hefley
Callahan	Fawell	Heineman
Calvert	Fields (TX)	Herger
Canady	Flanagan	Hilleary
Castle	Foley	Hobson
Chambliss	Forbes	Hoke
Chenoweth	Fowler	Hostettler

Houghton	Miller (FL)	Skeen
Hunter	Molinari	Skelton
Hyde	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (CT)	Montgomery	Smith (TX)
Johnson, Sam	Moorhead	Solomon
Jones	Murtha	Spence
Kelly	Myers	Stearns
Kim	Myrick	Stenholm
King	Nethercutt	Stockman
Kingston	Norwood	Stump
Klink	Ortiz	Stupak
Knollenberg	Oxley	Talent
Kolbe	Packard	Tanner
LaHood	Pallone	Tate
Latham	Parker	Tauzin
LaTourette	Paxon	Taylor (MS)
Laughlin	Payne (VA)	Taylor (NC)
Lazio	Peterson (MN)	Tejeda
Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Thornberry
Lightfoot	Pomeroy	Thornton
Lincoln	Porter	Tiahrt
Linder	Pryce	Torkildsen
Livingston	Quillen	Traficant
LoBiondo	Quinn	Vucanovich
Longley	Radanovich	Waldholtz
Lucas	Riggs	Walker
Manzullo	Roberts	Walsh
Mascara	Rogers	Wamp
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)
McCrery	Roukema	Weldon (FL)
McDade	Salmon	Weldon (PA)
McHale	Saxton	Weller
McHugh	Scarborough	White
McInnis	Schaefer	Wicker
McKeon	Schiff	Wilson
McNulty	Seastrand	Wolf
Metcalf	Shaw	Young (AK)
Meyers	Shuster	Young (FL)
Mica	Sisisky	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—4

Jefferson	Wise
Moakley	Yates

□ 1712

Messrs. PALLONE, KIM, and HOBSON, and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MATSUI, KILDEE, GILCHREST, BASS, HOYER, DICKEY, ABERCROMBIE, and LARGENT, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, \$118,267,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000.

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, \$42,963,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000.

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, \$19,655,000 to remain available until September 30, 2000.

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, \$31,502,000 to remain available until September 30, 2000.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program 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 authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, \$161,000,000, 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, \$126,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,337,596,000; in all \$1,463,996,000.

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, \$531,289,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,048,329,000; in all \$1,579,618,000.

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, \$294,503,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$863,213,000; in all \$1,157,716,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

Mr. NEUMANN. 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. NEUMANN: On page 8, line 2, strike \$1,157,716,000 and insert \$1,150,730,000.

□ 1715

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes or sooner, and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] will be

recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. The gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] and I are very, very concerned about housing for our military personnel.

The purpose of this amendment is to prohibit and stop the expenditure of \$6.9 million to build 33 housing units at an average cost of \$208,000 per housing unit. Buying housing units at an average cost of \$208,000 each is not an appropriate expenditure of our scarce tax dollars. This is especially true in view of the legitimate problems of substandard housing for our enlisted military personnel.

There are several key points that need to be made regarding this amendment. The first one is what we intend to do at these military bases is tear down housing built in the years 1957, 1958, 1959, 1968 and one report that simply says the 1950's. When I went back to my district this past weekend and I asked the folks in my district if they thought it was reasonable that we should tear down houses built in the 1950's and early 1960's and build brand new, they looked at me as though I was crazy.

The first point I would like to make, we are going to tear down housing built in the 1950's and 1960's and replace it with brand new. That is unacceptable in the world we live in.

I would reemphasize these housing units are only units that are going to cost the taxpayers an average cost of over \$200,000. Reports tell us there are 300,000 military families with inadequate housing, that there are 150,000 barracks spaces needed.

I would like to make a second major point on this amendment, that is, that we could take care of 437 barracks spaces with the same money we are going to spend on these 33 housing units.

This amendment is not about eliminating housing for our military but, rather, it is about spending the money in the most appropriate manner and making the best use of our tax dollars.

I would like my colleagues to carefully consider, when they go home to their districts, how they are going to respond to the charge that we have built these houses at over \$200,000 each, and now I am going to quote directly the reason for building these houses. This is directly from the Department of Defense reports. It says, and this is regarding the one at the New Mexico Air Force Base, "The condition of the house would reflect poorly on the many dignitaries that frequently are entertained in the house." The reason we are tearing down the old house and building anew is because it reflects poorly for entertainment purposes.

A second quote from the same report, "It is to build four-bedroom houses appropriate for family living and entertainment responsibilities for the wing

commander." Again, we see entertainment as the reason we are replacing this housing.

I quote from another report, and this is the North Carolina Air Force base, "This is to build housing appropriate for family living and the entertainment responsibility of the wing commander."

I would like my colleagues to think about our men and women in uniform who are living in substandard housing and think about how we are going to explain to our men and women in uniform why it is we spent over \$200,000 per housing unit at the expense of building 437 barracks spaces that could have been taken care of.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I just happened to be on the floor, and so I hope you will bear with these questions and bear with me.

I am noting in this amendment that there are several Air Force bases that are listed in which there would be a reduction here. Among them is Nellis Air Force Base, and I think it is \$1.375 billion, is it?

Mr. NEUMANN. Million.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Not nearly as much. But that Air Force base is in the district of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I presume you discussed this in some depth with her, did you not, before proposing this cut?

Mr. NEUMANN. No, sir, I did not. I simply looked for housing units that were going to cost in excess of \$200,000 per unit. I concluded it would not be a fair or good expenditure of our tax dollars to spend the money at a cost of over \$200,000 per unit when we could, in fact, be building barracks spaces to take care of our men and women in uniform, many units to replace this one.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I guess the reason for my question is that I have a great deal of respect for all of my colleagues, especially for the chairman of our subcommittee, and since it happens to be in her district, I would have thought you might have discussed it with her. But having said that, after the vote, I would suggest that you should discuss it with her, and I would urge a very, very strong no vote on the part of the House.

Mr. NEUMANN. I would just say that I have the greatest respect for my colleagues, as well, and to be perfectly honest with you, I did not check which district it was in. I simply identified them by the ones that were costing over \$200,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. At a time when Congress claims to be working hard at balancing the budget, I am really amazed the Military Construction Subcommittee has added over a half a billion dollars of projects making this bill 28 percent higher than last year's appropriation.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] has described that we are offering to strike the funding for 33 expensive homes.

Now, many of us citizens are ill-housed. This Congress is cutting funding on affordable housing, homeless shelter and shelters for battered women.

When the median cost of constructing a home in all but one of these areas is below \$75,000, we should not be spending over \$200,000 on luxury military housing. These are not houses for enlisted men and women. These are top dollar residences for the top brass.

I would say the prestige of the United States military relies on the prestige of their leadership, not on the quality of the homes in which they entertain.

It is wrong that enlisted military people live in substandard housing while this Congress funds excessively expensive units. It is not right.

I urge my colleagues to remember that every tax dollar we spend must be sensible and every military dollar we spend must be defensible.

I urge you to support the Neumann-Furse amendment.

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

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to an amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin. This amendment is flawed and if passed would only result in hurting morale and degrading the readiness of our armed forces.

Let there be no misunderstanding—this amendment attempts to throw away the hard work of both the authorizing and appropriations committees which have delivered to this House a bill that funds only military construction projects that are previously authorized, as part of a balanced budget by the year 2002. As my colleagues well know, the bill before us is an example of how things should work in Congress.

The military construction appropriations bill is the end result of the tireless work of Chairmen SPENCE, LIVINGSTON, HEFLEY, and VUCANOVICH, who have continually championed this Congress' support for our men and women in uniform. The amendment offered by Congressman NEUMANN not only undermines their hard work, but undermines the readiness of our Armed Forces.

When so many of our military families live in substandard homes and live off food stamps, I find it unconscionable that an amendment of this nature would be offered.

Let me also point out that the numbers used by my colleague from Wisconsin are incorrect. Hanscom Air Force Base, for example, is slated for replacement housing for enlisted personnel and junior officer families. According to this amendment, each home will cost \$208,000 apiece. I wish that were the case. In fact, according to the

Air Force, the average cost of each home is \$116,000. The difference in the numbers used by the Air Force and the sponsor of the amendment is that the Air Force has to account for extensive site preparation and demolition that includes removal of hazardous materials such as asbestos and lead paint. Costs associated with construction in Massachusetts are substantially higher than in Wisconsin—well over 20 percent higher, and 30 percent higher than the national average. Additionally, military family housing projects cannot depend on local or State entities to fund many of the services we take for granted—such as sewer connection lines, utilities, sidewalks, and recreation areas.

But let us not get bogged down in the abstract debate of numbers and statistics. What we are talking about here is people. At Hanscom, it is common for a five-person family to live in a cinder block home little more than 1,100 square feet. That's about the same size a Member has for a staff of 8 to 10 people. Can you imagine two parents and three children trying to live in that space?

The housing in question at Hanscom is known as some of the least desirable throughout the entire Air Force. Indeed, the service has identified it as a priority and has budgeted for its replacement in the next fiscal year. Both committees of jurisdiction have reviewed the project. Based solely on merit, those committees wisely expedited funding for this much-needed construction.

This is not a wish item, Mr. Chairman—this is vital to the service men and women and their families who are stationed at Hanscom. I ask all my colleagues to oppose this misguided amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment.

I would like to point out that the approved projects to replace the general officers' quarters at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base is something the Air Force and the Administration asked for before I was elected. I did not add this project to the budget, but I do support its construction, after realizing the obvious need for it.

The building in question was built in 1956. This project, more than anything else, is a matter of replacing a house which is showing the age and wear of continuous heavy use. Most everything, from the walls to the foundations and the underlying pavement, requires major repairs or replacement. Plumbing and electrical systems are outdated and do not meet the current standards for efficiency or safety.

In addition, the heating and air conditioning system needs to be totally replaced.

I would like to add that every study that could be done to evaluate this project has been done. Studies show that replacing the house would cost less over the long run than constantly repairing this 40-year-old system.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to call for quality of life for our troops, I do not think it is too much to ask that the legitimate needs of our commanders be met.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Last week we were discussing the living conditions for enlisted people, the fact that we have more than 15,000 on food stamps and are living in substandard trailer parks. Today we are here debating housing that averages \$208,000 a unit, and generally, despite the earlier speaker, not to address the living needs of enlisted people.

Here is one example, Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas, we have a home here for the general officer housing. It is totally inadequate for the position and entertainment responsibilities of the installation. Perhaps the general could use the officers' club or the golf club to entertain if he finds his home inadequate.

The kitchen configuration creates a circulation problem. Well, a lot of us have that problem in our homes. Generally we remodel. We do not tear the house down and start over, but the taxpayers are not paying for our homes.

Here the four bedrooms and their closets are undersized. Is the general entertaining in the bedrooms? What sort of entertainment are we talking about here?

They have outdated ceramic tile floors. I do not know, in my part of the country, people consider that a feature, and they actually pay extra for ceramic floors.

Wainscoting, that is kind of considered a plus out my way, too.

The question here is: Are we going to spend an average of \$208,000 a unit to better house the general staff because they do not want to entertain at the officers' club and they want to live in spiffy new houses? They have already got cars, drivers; they have already got the helicopter rides from the Pentagon to Andrews Air Force Base, the private jets around the country. Now they need new houses at an average of \$208,000 each with no rent paid in return.

□ 1730

I think it is time to draw the line somewhere. Support housing for our enlisted folks, but no more for the generals and the top brass.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, would just like to close with the three main points. In this thing we are talking about eliminating 33 housing units at an average cost of \$208,000 per unit. The same money could take care of 437 spaces and barracks that currently are hous-

ing our men and women in uniform at substandard levels.

The second one is that we are going to tear down houses built in the late 1950's and early 1960's, and in America we would find that generally to be an unacceptable practice.

Most of all, this rifle shot kind of target in a few bases in our district was not selected based on whose district they were in, but rather it is selected based on the fact that they are excessive spending in a bill that is 28 percent over last year's number.

We are spending in this, our first appropriations bill, 28 percent more than what we spent last year, and I would like everyone to know that one of the main reasons we are standing here right now is because of the fact that a 28-percent spending increase in any category I find personally unacceptable.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a comment?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, the problem here is not the fact that we do not need to do these houses. There is absolutely dilapidated quarters that need to be replaced in all quarters and what I would point out to the gentleman on the one point, when he said we had a 28-percent increase, and that is true, but if we go back to the past 10 years, military construction budget at best, at the very best, has been stagnant for the past 10 years. During the Bush administration we had one series that we were absolutely at a pause. We did not do one thing in family housing and military construction. We had a complete pause.

So I say to my colleagues, if you do the replacement, it would take us over 50 years at the replacement rate that we are going now, so the growth is warranted. We have been stagnant for 10 years. This is warranted, this increase.

Now we may need some oversight at the cost per square foot for family housing and for general housing, but that is the only place we need to look at because we do need to upgrade all the quarters, both enlisted men and general quarters, and I am going to reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify the cost of the units the gentleman from Wisconsin is referring to. He has incorrectly estimated the average cost to be \$208,000. The cost associated with these projects is not purely construction. It also includes: demolition of existing dilapidated units; asbestos removal; lead-based paint removal; utilities and site preparations. Eliminating these costs—assuming the gentleman would agree that asbestos and lead-based removal is of importance—the average construction cost per unit is \$120,829. This is below the 1994 median sales price of \$130,000 for all new homes nationwide.

Is the gentleman aware that prior to new construction the Department is re-

quired to conduct an economic analysis that compares the alternatives of new construction, revitalization, leasing, and status quo? Based on the net present values and benefits, the Air Force found replacement to be the most cost efficient option over the life of these projects.

For some apparent reason, the gentleman has chosen to single out five projects which involve not only housing for senior officers, but also senior and junior noncommissioned officers.

I say to the gentleman, Mr. NEUMANN, we have an all volunteer force—and that includes noncommissioned officers as well as officers of any rank. Are you telling the Members of this body that the quality of life of any man of woman who serves this country and is prepared to risk his or her life is more important than another? Are you saying that those individuals who make a multiyear commitment to the defense of this country and who grow to become leaders do not deserve a decent place to live?

As a member of the National Security Subcommittee, I am sure the gentleman is aware that it costs roughly \$1.3 million to train a fighter pilot in today's Air Force. Is it not worth the minor expenditure to provide decent housing to keep that pilot in the Air Force?

And, Mr. NEUMANN, I remind you that this Nation is still on a high because of the courageous survival of Capt. Scott O'Grady and the success of the Marines who went into Bosnia to rescue him. Mr. NEUMANN, members of our forces—at all ranks—were involved in that mission. Are you telling me that those men and women who just happen to be officers don't deserve a decent place to live?

As long as I am chairman of this subcommittee, I will work to improve the housing of every individual who serves this country—they deserve no less.

I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 160, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—266

Ackerman	Beilenson	Brown (OH)
Allard	Bentsen	Brownback
Andrews	Bereuter	Bryant (TN)
Archer	Berman	Bryant (TX)
Baesler	Bilirakis	Bunn
Baldacci	Blute	Burr
Ballenger	Boehner	Camp
Barcia	Bonior	Canady
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Cardin
Bartlett	Brewster	Castle
Barton	Browder	Chabot
Bass	Brown (CA)	Chapman
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Chenoweth

Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clayton  
Clement  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (IL)  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Costello  
Coyne  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cubin  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Durbin  
Ehlers  
English  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Furse  
Ganske  
Gephardt  
Gillmor  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Harman  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hinchee  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden

Horn  
Houghton  
Hutchinson  
Ingليس  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klink  
Klug  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
LaTourrette  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Moran  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Neumann  
Ney  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri

## NOES—160

Abercrombie  
Armye  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bateman  
Bevill  
Billray  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Boehler  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Borski  
Bunning  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert

Chambliss  
Clay  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cox  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
DeLay  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doollittle  
Dornan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehrlich

Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Reed  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Schaefer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Studds  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Upton  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
White  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Hayes  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hoke  
Hostettler  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
King  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Latham  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Livingston  
Lucas  
Markey  
McCollum  
McCreary

Gilman  
Heineman  
Jefferson

## NOT VOTING—8

LaFalce  
Moakley  
Velazquez

## □ 1800

Messrs. NETHERCUTT, MARKEY, HASTINGS of Florida, MCDADE, WATT of North Carolina, FOGLIETTA, and SHAW, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GEJDENSON, TRAFICANT, FORBES, SPRATT, FIELDS of Texas, DE LA GARZA, HALL of Texas, CRAPO, and WARD, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## □ 1800

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

## 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, \$3,772,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2000; for Operation and maintenance, \$30,467,000; in all \$34,239,000.

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

## (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$22,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, subject to thirty days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to this Fund from amounts appropriated in this Act for Construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to that Fund: *Provided further*, That appropriations made

Scarborough  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Shaw  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (TX)  
Spence  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Stump  
Tanner  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Torkildsen  
Towns  
Visclosky  
Vucanovich  
Walsh  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (PA)  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

available to the Fund in this Act shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of, and amendments made by, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

## HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For use in the Homeowners Assistance Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3374), \$75,586,000, to remain available until expended.

## BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

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), \$964,843,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$224,800,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

## 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), \$2,148,480,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$232,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

## BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV

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), \$784,569,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds will be available for construction only to the extent detailed budget justification is transmitted to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That such funds are available solely for the approved 1995 base realignments and closures.

## 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: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply in the case of contracts for environmental restoration at an installation that is being closed or realigned where payments are made from a Base Realignment and Closure Account.

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, in any NATO member country, or in the Arabian Gulf, 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, or in the Arabian Gulf, 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 appropriate Committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations, 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.

SEC. 114. 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. 115. 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. 116. 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. 117. 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. 118. 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. 119. 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, Japan, Korea, and United States allies in the Arabian Gulf to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

## (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds 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. 121. 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. 122. (a) 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) 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.

## (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 123. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred among the Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374); the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991; and appropriations available to the Department of Defense for the Homeowners Assistance Program of the Department of Defense. Any amounts so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund, account, or appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 124. The Army shall use George Air Force Base as the interim airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches Initial Operational Capability as the permanent airhead.

SEC. 125. (a) In order to ensure the continued protection and enhancement of the open spaces of Fort Sheridan, the Secretary of the Army shall convey to the Lake County Forest Preserve District, Illinois (in this section referred to as the "District"), all right, title, and interest of the United States to a parcel of surplus real property at Fort Sheridan consisting of approximately 290 acres located north of the southerly boundary line of the historic district at the post, including improvements thereon.

(b) As consideration for the conveyance by the Secretary of the Army of the parcel of real property under subsection (a), the District shall provide maintenance and care to the remaining Fort Sheridan cemetery, pursuant to an agreement to be entered into between the District and the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to convey the remaining surplus property at former Fort Sheridan to the Fort Sheridan Joint Planning Committee, or its successor, for an amount no less than the fair market value (as determined by the Secretary of the Army) of the property to be conveyed.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property (including improvements thereon) to be conveyed under subsections (a) and (c) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the Lake County Forest Preserve District, and the Fort Sheridan Joint Planning Committee, respectively.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. 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. FRANK of Massachusetts: Page 19, after line 12, insert the following new section:

SEC. 126. The amounts otherwise provided in this Act for the following accounts are hereby reduced by 5 percent:

- (1) "Military Construction, Army".
- (2) "Military Construction, Navy".
- (3) "Military Construction, Air Force".
- (4) "Military Construction, Defense-wide".
- (5) "Military Construction, Army National Guard".
- (6) "Military Construction, Air National Guard".
- (7) "Military Construction, Army Reserve".
- (8) "Military Construction, Naval Reserve".
- (9) "Military Construction, Air Force Reserve".
- (10) "North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Security Investment Program".

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes or less and that the time be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut 5 percent from those accounts in this bill that do not affect housing or the Base Closing Commission. Those two accounts are most of the bill. The amendment is to almost 3 billion dollars' worth of new construction. The 3 billion dollars' worth of new construction, other than housing and other than base closing, includes regular military construction and it includes the NATO infrastructure. And it does seem to me, time NATO could come here and build some infrastructure. It would save \$148 million.

The bill is significantly over the President's recommendation. And even if my amendment is adopted, this bill will still, in these accounts, have more money than the President recommended. And it will also have a significant increase over last year.

We are talking here about military construction at a time when we are closing things down. I leave 95 percent in the bill. I leave more than the President asked for. I leave more than we had last year. I am struck, Mr. Chairman, by my own moderation in this particular amendment, but I am trying to get something accomplished.

This would go into reducing the deficit. It is an appropriation. If we save this \$148 million, the deficit at \$148 million less, housing is not affected, base closing is not affected, and I do not believe the American people will be one bit less secure.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this is not a wise amendment. We have got a committee process, and that committee process is proceeding within the appropriations cycle to meet the recommendations reflected in the budget resolution adopted by this House of Representatives and a companion resolution adopted by the other body just a relatively few short weeks ago.

We are balancing the budget by the year 2002. The President says he does not want to balance the budget until the year 2005, but he has become a budget balancer and has become convinced of the need to avoid disaster for the future by making sure we get our spending in line with our revenues.

The Committee on Appropriations is meeting regularly. We are bringing forth bills within the House budget caps. The gentleman says, this bill is above the President's request. That is true. But this bill also addresses the needs for base closing; roughly 35 percent of the bill addresses the need to pay the money in order that we can close the bases.

This bill addresses the fact that 60 percent of our current military housing is inadequate, woefully inadequate in many instances. We are addressing the military construction demands of the armed services of this country. We are addressing the needs of the NATO commitments around the world. And this bill, along with its 12 counterparts in the appropriations process, will come under the budget allotments adopted by the House of Representatives a few short weeks ago.

If you want to scrap the budget; scrap the committee process; if you want to handle all of the business of the House of Representatives on the floor, then start with this amendment and let us add in a few others. Every time we come up with an appropriations bill, we can say we all are experts on every single issue, and we will just gut the hell out of the bills and the budget. But we may be causing ourselves great harm in the future.

I would say to my colleagues that the committee process works, if they will give it an opportunity to work. Unfortunately, there are those who think that their wisdom supersedes the committee process and maybe in some instances they do. Maybe they are very bright people. I give them credit.

But I want to commend the gentlewoman from Nevada and her staff and all of the members of the subcommittee who have worked very hard on this bill to meet the needs of this Nation. A mindless amendment of this sort, cutting across the board, even though it is confined to certain narrow categories, is not the way we should go about balancing the budget. If that is what we

need, then we should just not stop here. We should just close down the committees and all of us sit on the floor and each of us come up with a new idea on what we should cut.

Eventually, we will get the balanced budget, because we will not be spending any Federal money at all. But I dare say that will be because the U.S. Government and this great Nation of ours will come to a screeching halt, and we will be sorely ashamed of abdicating our responsibility to our people to represent them wisely and efficiently and with foresight and with good judgment. All of those are lacking in this amendment. I urge its defeat.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have not heard such a touching plea for the sacrosanct nature of anything a committee does since Jack Brooks left.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I must say I was amazed to hear this amendment classified as a mindless amendment, because I was getting ready to taunt the gentleman from Massachusetts that he had mellowed; this was a mellow amendment for the gentleman and that indeed middle age may be setting in. I do not know. But I rise in strong support of this amendment, and let us talk about it.

First of all, the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment does not touch the base closing process over there, nor does it touch housing that is over there that is essential for troops. This only touches additional add-ons in the whole structure for NATO.

As one of the Members who has been talking about burdensharing forever and ever and ever and ever, and every time we come to this floor they say, great idea but now is not the time, this is not the day, when are we ever going to deal with this? The NATO infrastructure formula has not been changed since NATO began. Our allies have changed a lot. They have become a lot richer. In fact all of them together have a larger economy than ours.

But we still put in the same amount that we did right after World War II, when we were carrying a large share of the budget.

□ 1815

That formula did change in Japan and other countries. They have not gotten enough credit for it. They are picking up much, much more of the infrastructure budget. In fact, Japan is practically picking up the whole thing. However, no, not Europe. We would not want to tell the Europeans that they could now do a little more because they are a little richer.

The gentleman's amendment only cuts 5 percent non-base closing and non-housing, and yet it will save \$148 billion. One of the reasons this is higher than the President asked for and higher than the Pentagon asked for is

because, as we know, on this side of the Congress our budget is \$9.7 billion more than the Pentagon asked for, more than the President asked for, and more than the Senate did.

Since we do not have a budget resolution, this committee was forced to mark up to those higher levels. There is the padded budget, therefore.

If Members vote for the gentleman's amendment, which I am going to do, we are taking the padding out. We are taking some of the padding out, and getting back to the realistic number that the Commander in Chief and the Pentagon recommended.

Of course, the reason I think it is so mellow is the gentleman and I used to go after both the Pentagon and the Commander in Chief for asking too much. However, we are just saying here it is being padded ever more to kick it up that \$9-plus billion, because we have to use fillers in order to do that, to try and continue this budget negotiation with the Senate. If Members are into that, fine, vote against the amendment.

However, I think the time has come that reason should come forward, as we are slashing bases at home, as we are slashing the infrastructure at home, as we are harming all sorts of things. In fact, the base closure commission is meeting today, as it has been meeting every other day, and why in the world we cannot vote for a 5 percent cut in Europe that would be \$148 billion, I do not know. I do not get it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentlewoman made that point about the budget. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in his plea for not interfering with the sacred deliberations of the holy committee and not profaning it with our individual judgments, said "We are just doing what the budget said. First, the budget is a ceiling. It is not a floor, it is not a command. The budget is a ceiling."

Second, as the gentlewoman said, the House budget figure is almost certainly going to be higher than the Senate budget figure, than the final budget figure. The House is \$9 billion in this account, the overall military account, higher than the Senate. No one thinks the conference report is coming out at the House number.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules said there were delicate negotiations going on with the Senate now, so we are not going to have a final budget resolution that is at this higher number, and we are anticipating that in a reasonable way.

I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, it is not 1945, it is 1995. The formula does not look any different in 1995 than it did in 1945. The wall came down but the for-

mula did not change. The cold war is over but the formula did not change.

The question is, Mr. Chairman, what are they building over there? We are leaving 95 percent of it intact, not touching the base closure, not touching housing. If we stand here and say we cannot even cut 5 percent out of the stuff we are building in NATO under a post-World War II formula, we have never had the guts to tell them to change, we are really, I think, wimpish.

I have always felt we are really Europhiles, and that we really always kind of yield and defer to them. I have always seen that going on in all the burdensharing amendments. If we cannot ask for this little bit, especially since we are so over the budget, so over what everyone asks, I think we really look silly.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this amendment and I hope people vote aye, very, very affirmatively.

Mr. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] who is ranking on our committee.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I admire people for wanting to cut the budget and save money that we can apply toward the deficit, but I think this is a little bit wrongly directed. We exempt the base closure, the BRACC, we exempt that. We exempt family housing, which is good. We have fought over the past 10 years to increase this budget. However, as I said earlier, it has been stagnant for 10 years.

Just let me tell the Members some of the things that are going to be affected with this 5-percent across the board. It is not going to affect family housing. It is not going to affect BRACC. However, let me tell the Members what it is going to do. It is going to go directly to quality of life, because we would affect the building of barracks.

The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and I went to Fort Bragg in North Carolina. We went through some barracks in North Carolina, where if Members took their kids to camp or to college, and they took us in and said "This is where you are going to be living," we would load them up in the car, put the suitcases back in, and we would come home. We would not let them stay at camp for 2 weeks in the barracks which some of these people are living in.

That is one of the things it is going to affect. Also, child development. We have made some real strides in child development. It is going to affect child development, which directly impacts on retention to these men. In many cases both parents are in the service, or either one parent is in the service and the other is working, and they have the day care centers and the child development programs. We would be going to cut that.

Also, the hospitals and medical centers all across this country, and in Fort Bragg, NC, we have a new medical facility that is being built, and clinics all

across this country. We are experimenting with mental care in some of these bases all across the country. That is going to be cut.

We are also going to be cutting some other critical programs, like chemical weapons demilitarization. I know that this budget is more than it was last year, Mr. Chairman. Thank God for that, because we have been trying to beef up the military construction budget for years. It has been stagnant.

However, let me point out one other thing. If we do this 5-percent across-the-board cut, and then we get a budget agreement, we have \$500 million in this budget that was marked up on the basis of the budget that was passed in this House that we very easily could not have when we come to a compromise. We may have to lose another \$500 million, and if we add to that this 5 percent, plus we add to the cut that was just made on an earlier vote, this budget is going to be about stagnant again in this session.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot stand that, if we want to use this voluntary Army, we want to have retention, and we want to get the very best people that can operate these sophisticated weapons and serve us well.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and I have talked many times about quality of life and about burdensharing. We are not going overboard for building facilities in Europe. We did beef up a little in Korea because we had a serious situation there, but if we take the cuts we have just made, and if we do this 5-percent cut and then we lose on top of that a half a billion dollars because of a compromise on the budget conference between the House and Senate, this budget once again will be a stagnant budget, and we will not be able to do the things we need to do for our men and women in the Armed Forces.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

First, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] is wrong when he says if we take this 5-percent cut and then have a budget conference reduction of a half a billion, they will be additive. No, this will be a way of reaching that.

The budget conference would lower the number that this goes to. My amendment would be a way of reaching that lowering, so they would not be added. It would not be cumulative. This would be a way of dealing with that.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, just a question. Once we have passed this bill, we go to conference with the Senate, and we come out with a bottom-line number, if it is \$500 million, is the gentleman saying that his 5 percent would go to that bottom line?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I assumed the gentleman

was talking about the budget conference. My point is the amount that we are going to be able to vote is contingent on the budget resolution, and the budget resolution is way above this.

Yes, the final figure will be a compromise in this particular account between what we vote and the Senate votes, but what I was talking about was the budget resolution. The budget resolution is the one where there is going to be a reduction on what the House voted, and this is not additive to that, this is going to be a way of reaching that.

Mr. HEFNER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, what I was getting at, when they reach a compromise on the budget, the 302 allocation, it is \$500 million less than we have now, then the 5-percent cut will go to that number?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It would be a way of reaching that number. It would not be on top of that number, of course. It would not automatically reduce it by 5 percent plus \$500 million, of course not.

Mr. Chairman, let me continue with a couple of other points. The gentleman read some very appealing things here: child development. Child development is very appealing. It gets \$57 million out of the \$3 billion.

NATO alone, Mr. Chairman, NATO alone gets more money in this bill than the entire amount my amendment would cut. NATO in this bill get \$161 million. My total amendment cut is \$148. It is true, Mr. Chairman, if they decide, and the 5-percent cut leaves it to the discretion of the committee. It is 5 percent, not in every single number that the gentleman mentioned. It does not mandate a 5-percent cut in child development or in barracks. It says find 5 percent of cut. Cut NATO by half and we have met already 2½ percent. Cut some of the other construction.

What we are saying is, Mr. Chairman, they are going to spend \$161 million on NATO along when this House has felt that it is the Europeans who owe us, rather than the other way around. We think with some cut out of NATO and elsewhere we can find it.

Mr. Chairman, we have a terrible budget crisis, we keep being told. Yes, there are things we would like to do, but we cannot exempt any part of the budget, in my judgment, and then reach an sensible zero figure.

Just to reiterate, this does not affect family housing, it does not affect base closing. It need not affect hospitals or child development if the subcommittee does not want it to. We can make it all up out of NATO. We can make half up out of NATO.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the budget resolution is concerned, if the budget resolution reduces the budget authority, we are going to have to cut by more than this amendment. This amendment will not then be relevant if the budget authority is so substantially reduced, except it is a way of

saying yes, we are going to cut in the NATO account, but we are not going to cut family housing in BRACC.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, this body has exercised pretty sound judgment with regard to having an all-volunteer military. With that, and we talk about support for an all-volunteer force, it means the readiness. We have talked about it on the House floor often. It means training the force and equipping the force so they will be ready.

Second is pay and benefits for an all-volunteer force. Third is taking care of the military family, and what that encompasses. We talk about it on the House floor as the quality-of-life issues, whether it is housing and recreation, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, this issue about let us do a 5-percent cut across the board, someone called it mindless. I am not going to call it mindless. I have voted in the past for across-the-board cuts. However, this one, I think the chairwoman and the ranking Member have done an excellent job in this military construction budget. There is no padding, as the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] said. There are some very important decisions that need to be done, and I think that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations did a very good job.

What are we cutting, when we talk about a 5-percent cut? That is new construction, whether it is for port facilities, a fire station, medical facilities, hospitals, dental clinics, outpatient clinics, recreational facilities; we are talking about child care centers, we are talking about barracks. When they say cutting for housing, I would like to ask the author of this amendment, he says it would not touch housing. Would his amendment affect military barracks?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUYER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman, not if the subcommittee does not want it to. My amendment gives full discretion to the subcommittee, and would not mandate any reduction in barracks at all.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it also would affect environmental compliance. When the gentleman talks also about its impact upon NATO and our security interests, chemical weapons, demilitarization, while I applaud across-the-board cuts, I think that the subcommittee has done an excellent job, and we should support the subcommittee.

When they say that this is not going to touch BRACC, when they say this will not touch BRACC, first of all, to

my colleagues, we have to remember there are a lot of things in motion out there, whether it is in NATO or here in the United States, with regard to consolidation of posts and the impact upon installations. There are a lot of decisions that base commanders out there have to make, whether it is the commander of a fort. To say it will not be affected by BRACC does not really take some rational thought. A lot of these military construction projects, especially in Europe, are based because of consolidation of the force.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

□ 1830

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I don't relish engaging in debate with the gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentlewoman from Colorado, but let me just tell you what this amendment says.

The amounts otherwise provided in this act for the following accounts are hereby reduced by 5 percent: military construction Army, military construction Navy, military construction Air Force, military construction defensewide, military construction Army National Guard, military construction Air National Guard, military construction Army Reserve, military construction Naval Reserve, military construction Air Force Reserve, North Atlantic Treaty Organization security investment programs. Each one of these would carry with it a 5 percent. I wish the gentleman, if it was possible, to take it all out of NATO if you are going to make the cut.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman would yield for a unanimous-consent request, I would ask unanimous consent that the amendment be amended so that at the subcommittee's discretion as much as possible could be taken out of NATO. I ask unanimous consent for that amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, I tried.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as was just made clear, I was prepared to give the subcommittee more power to cut NATO but they do not want to do that.

This does not mandate cuts in barracks or child development. It does cut, and I agree, as worded it has less flexibility than it should have with regard to NATO. I would agree to changing that, but as I said, they don't want to do it.

Here is where we are. We have broad agreement that we are going to get to a balanced budget soon. We are in a zero sum situation. If we do not make

reductions here to get the deficit down, then either we raise taxes somewhere else, which is very, very unlikely, or the cuts in Medicare are deeper than they have to be, the cuts in aid to college students are deeper than they have to be, the money to reimburse communities trying to meet existing Federal mandates is less than it has to be.

We talk about no further unfunded mandates. I am for that, but the legislation we passed does not touch any of the existing Federal mandates that are unfunded. I would like to make some more money available to do that.

If we pass legislation like this without this amendment, if we lavish the \$161 million on NATO, if we go more than the Pentagon asked for for construction elsewhere, we mandate deeper cuts in all these other programs. Members will go to their districts and say, "Gee, I want to balance the budget, and I am sorry we have to really cut the National Institutes of Health. I am sorry we will do much less research on disease. I am sorry transportation will get hurt. I wish we didn't have to cut Medicare so much. I wish we did not have to insist that the cost of living increase for Social Security be reduced as their budget resolution says."

Well, this is why it happens. You cannot claim helplessness when you are talking about these cuts and then vote to insist on spending on military construction, other than housing and other than BRAC more than the Pentagon asks for. I am sure that many of these projects, most of this money, would be usefully spent, but that is no longer the criterion. What we have here is a view that says we will exempt the ordinary operations of the U.S. military from the discipline that everybody else gets.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago a great thing happened in the world. The Soviet Union collapsed. Yes, it is still a threat in some ways, but our major enemy now just failed to take a military hospital, with their crack troops, manned by 50 irregulars.

There is simply no qualitative comparison to be made between the nature of the threats that face us today and those that faced us 10 years ago. There are bad people in the world, there are people who run countries who should not even be allowed to drive cars in a rational world, but they have not got the power to threaten us. What we are doing is acting as if the United States was still threatened.

I heard a Member say during the debate on the military bill, "Well, the world is a more dangerous place now because the Soviet Union collapsed." That nostalgia for a major enemy capable of destroying us is nonsensical in any other context than trying to put more money here, and more money here will inevitably mean less in Medicare, less in college student loans, less in the National Institutes of Health, less in helping people comply with en-

vironmental mandates, less in law enforcement.

Vote to give this \$148 million to the Pentagon, vote for the full funding of the NATO infrastructure gift from America to the economies of western Europe, vote for other additional military construction at a time when the threat has diminished, and you take away from every other account. You deprive yourselves of the argument that you regret the other cuts in important programs that help people because you are voluntarily taking the money from Medicare, taking the money from student loans, taking the money from the National Institutes of Health, taking the money from Head Start, taking the money from pollution enforcement, and putting it here where it is at a much lower level of social need.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The committee has done its job and has been responsible.

This bill is about things the gentleman from Massachusetts should be able to support. It is about the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and their families—that is what this bill is about. Providing for their working environment, their housing, their hospitals and clinics, their child care centers—the gentleman's amendment impacts all of these things.

Mr. Chairman, as we find ourselves with fewer personnel in the Armed Forces we are going to have to provide bases that are maintained in top order and personnel must be adequately housed.

Does the gentleman think our soldiers are overhoused—because his amendment could impact a total of \$636 million for troop housing. Does the gentleman not believe that child development centers are important to single military parents, dual military couples, and military personnel with a civilian employed spouse—because his amendment could impact a total of \$57 million for child development centers. Does the gentleman not believe the members of the Armed Forces and their families deserve to have updated hospitals and clinics because his amendment could impact a total of \$178 million to provide these facilities. Does the gentleman not believe that we should meet the requirements of the Federal Facilities Compliance Act because his amendment could impact a total of \$207 million for environmental compliance.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has been responsible and reviewed each project provided for in this bill. The gentleman is not being responsible by approaching his reductions in such a vague manner. I ask my colleagues to oppose his amendment and suggest if

he is serious about cutting this bill that he provide this body with the specific projects that would be related to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 290, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—131

Abercrombie	Ganske	Olver
Ackerman	Gejdenson	Owens
Andrews	Green	Pastor
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Hamilton	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Becerra	Hinchey	Petri
Bentsen	Hoekstra	Poshard
Berman	Horn	Rahall
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Borski	Jacobs	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Rohrabacher
Cardin	Kennelly	Roukema
Clay	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kleczka	Rush
Collins (IL)	Klug	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Sanders
Conyers	Levin	Sanford
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Schroeder
Coyne	Lincoln	Sensenbrenner
Danner	Lofgren	Serrano
DeFazio	Luther	Shays
DeLauro	Maloney	Slaughter
Dellums	Markey	Smith (MI)
Deutsch	Martinez	Stokes
Dingell	Martini	Studds
Dixon	McCarthy	Stupak
Doggett	McDermott	Torres
Durbin	McHale	Torrice
Ehlers	McKinney	Towns
Engel	Meehan	Tucker
Eshoo	Menendez	Upton
Evans	Mfume	Volkmer
Farr	Miller (CA)	Waters
Fattah	Mineta	Watt (NC)
Fawell	Minge	Waxman
Filner	Mink	Williams
Foglietta	Moran	Wise
Ford	Nadler	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Neal	Wyden
Franks (NJ)	Oberstar	Zimmer
Furse	Obey	

NOES—290

Allard	Boucher	Coburn
Archer	Brewster	Coleman
Armey	Browder	Collins (GA)
Bachus	Brown (FL)	Combest
Baesler	Brownback	Condit
Baker (CA)	Bryant (TN)	Cooley
Baker (LA)	Bunn	Cox
Ballenger	Bunning	Cramer
Barr	Burr	Crane
Barrett (NE)	Burton	Crapo
Bartlett	Buyer	Creameans
Barton	Callahan	Cubin
Bass	Calvert	Cunningham
Bateman	Camp	Davis
Beilenson	Canady	de la Garza
Bereuter	Castle	Deal
Bevill	Chabot	DeLay
Bilbray	Chambliss	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Chapman	Dickey
Bishop	Chenoweth	Dicks
Bliley	Christensen	Dooley
Blute	Chrysler	Doolittle
Boehlert	Clement	Dornan
Boehner	Clinger	Doyle
Bonilla	Clyburn	Dreier
Bono	Coble	Dunn

Edwards	Kennedy (RI)	Reed
Ehrlich	Kim	Regula
Emerson	King	Richardson
English	Kingston	Riggs
Ensign	Klink	Rivers
Everett	Knollenberg	Roberts
Ewing	Kolbe	Rogers
Fazio	LaFalce	Ros-Lehtinen
Fields (LA)	LaHood	Rose
Fields (TX)	Largent	Roth
Flake	Latham	Royce
Flanagan	LaTourette	Salmon
Foley	Laughlin	Sawyer
Forbes	Lazio	Saxton
Fowler	Leach	Scarborough
Fox	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Franks (CT)	Lewis (KY)	Schiff
Frelinghuysen	Lightfoot	Scott
Frisa	Linder	Seastrand
Funderburk	Lipinski	Shadegg
Gallely	Livingston	Shaw
Gekas	LoBiondo	Shuster
Gephardt	Longley	Sisisky
Geren	Lowe	Skaggs
Gibbons	Lucas	Skeen
Gilchrist	Manzullo	Skelton
Gillmor	Mascara	Smith (NJ)
Gilman	Matsui	Smith (TX)
Gonzalez	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Goodlatte	McCrery	Solomon
Goodling	McDade	Souder
Gordon	McHugh	Spence
Goss	McInnis	Spratt
Graham	McIntosh	Stearns
Greenwood	McKeon	Stenholm
Gunderson	McNulty	Stockman
Gutknecht	Meek	Stump
Hall (OH)	Metcalf	Talent
Hall (TX)	Meyers	Tanner
Hancock	Mica	Tate
Hansen	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Harman	Molinari	Taylor (MS)
Hastert	Mollohan	Taylor (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Montgomery	Tejeda
Hastings (WA)	Moorhead	Thomas
Hayes	Morella	Thompson
Hayworth	Myers	Thornberry
Hefley	Myrick	Thornton
Hefner	Nethercutt	Thurman
Heineman	Neumann	Tiahrt
Herger	Ney	Torkildsen
Hilleary	Norwood	Traficant
Hobson	Nussle	Visclosky
Hoke	Ortiz	Vucanovich
Holden	Orton	Waldholtz
Hostettler	Oxley	Walker
Houghton	Packard	Walsh
Hoyer	Pallone	Wamp
Hunter	Parker	Ward
Hutchinson	Paxon	Watts (OK)
Hyde	Payne (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Inglis	Peterson (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Istook	Pickett	Weller
Johnson (CT)	Pombo	White
Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy	Whitfield
Johnson, E. B.	Porter	Wicker
Johnson, Sam	Portman	Wolf
Jones	Pryce	Young (AK)
Kaptur	Quillen	Young (FL)
Kasich	Quinn	Zeliff
Kelly	Radanovich	

## NOT VOTING—13

Duncan	Murtha	Wilson
Frost	Schumer	Wynn
Jefferson	Stark	Yates
Manton	Velazquez	
Moakley	Vento	

□ 1859

Mr. COX changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. RANGEL and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1900

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. 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. NOR-

WOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, 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. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON BILL MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT, 1996

Mr. MEYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-147) on the resolution (H. Res. 170) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

Committee on Agriculture; Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary, and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, June 15, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my Committee has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,  
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-  
MITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,  
Washington, DC, June 15, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House, that the Committee on Small Business has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

JAN MEYERS,  
Chair.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]