

to me in this process has been the private and public threats to a Senator who simply wants to continue the tradition of public hearings. I will not be deterred. I believe most Senators will support public hearings.

Mr. President, I urge the Ethics Committee again today, on this Senate floor, to call a meeting of their committee, which last week they canceled, which this week they have not scheduled, to open this particular case to the public. It is, without doubt, the right thing to do.

However, if the committee refuses to do this, I will have no alternative, as I have said before, but to bring this issue to the Senate floor directly. My legislation is ready. It is straightforward. I will offer it at the earliest opportunity next week if we have no action.

In my view, a major procedural change overturning decades of well-established precedent must be debated by the full Senate. I think this is very, very serious. The charges are serious against the Senator, but equally important, is that the precedents of this U.S. Senate not be cast aside.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc to H.R. 1817, provided that no point of order shall be considered as having been waived by reason of this agreement, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that Senator BINGAMAN be recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment, and that a time agreement has been reached, an hour equally divided on both sides, with Senator BINGAMAN in charge, and the managers in charge of the opposite side.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent request be amended to reflect that there be no second-degree amend-

ment in order, except a perfecting amendment that the Senator has to offer, and the hour time agreement would apply to all—to the amendment and the perfecting amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the Senator agree, if a vote is ordered, to have a vote at the same time as the votes relating to the rescissions bill?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I advised the Republican manager earlier that I am glad to do that, except that I think I would like to reserve the right of each of the sponsors, Senators MCCAIN and Senator KERREY, to speak for a few moments about the bill.

If they have not had a chance to do that, I want to have that opportunity.

Mr. REID. That would be under the time that the Senator controls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1834

(Purpose: To reduce by \$300,000,000 the amount appropriated by the bill)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. KERREY, proposes an amendment numbered 1834.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 22, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 127. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated by this Act for military construction and family housing is hereby reduced by \$300,000,000.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I asked that the amendment be read because I think it is very straightforward. Members should not have any difficulty understanding what the amendment is. It is an amendment offered by myself, Senator MCCAIN, and Senator KERREY from Nebraska.

What it does is it proposes to strike \$300 million from this bill and to bring the level of spending in this bill back to the level that the President requested. That request from the President, from the administration, was not an insubstantial request. It was almost \$2 billion above last year's level. The budget request was for \$10.698 billion for military construction and family housing, which was an increase of \$1.963 billion over the 1995 appropriation.

The budget request included a major initiative on family housing, an increase of \$605 million above the 1995 level. It also included \$1.2 billion in additional funding to carry out the base closure and realignment that has been ordered by current and past base closure commissions.

So we are, in this amendment, not trying to interfere with a substantial increase in military construction funding over last year's level. The Presi-

dent felt that was appropriate. The administration felt it was appropriate. We are not, in this amendment, trying to attack that. What we are saying, though, is that we need to have some limit on the extent of the add-ons that we, in Congress, engage in, if, in fact, we do have a concern about deficit reduction—and we clearly need to have that concern.

The committee was able to find about \$400 million to reduce in what the President requested; another \$57 million in rescissions from prior-year appropriations. If the committee had stayed within the President's request, that would have given them an amount of \$474 million to earmark for various items that are called to the attention of committee members of this body on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, \$474 million did not appear to be enough for Member items. The committee added an additional \$300 million to cover those items, and I believe this is a luxury that we cannot defend to the American people at a time when deficit reduction is paramount in the Nation's political agenda, and deserves to be paramount in the agenda of the Nation when our debt is ballooning to almost \$5 trillion.

The committee will argue that the projects that they have added, the \$747 million in all that they have added, meet the criteria which the Senator from Arizona, my cosponsor on this amendment, has been in the forefront of establishing. That is, all of these projects are in the Pentagon's 5-year plan and they have merely moved up the execution of the projects for this next fiscal year. They will argue that the National Guard has come to rely on these add-ons because the Pentagon always leaves out things which are necessary for the National Guard.

These arguments do have some merit, and I think they can be used to justify the most important \$474 million of add-ons. But in my view, the arguments cannot justify the marginal \$300 million that has been added to that. Unlike the cuts which we will make in future appropriations bills which come before the Senate in areas such as education and research and health, the projects which are ultimately cut if our amendment is approved will be in future defense requests, some next year, some as late as the year 2001. Essentially, these are projects which the administration said are meritorious, but we cannot afford them this year. What I am saying by this amendment, and what my cosponsors are saying, is we agree with that. We cannot afford the additional \$300 million this year.

I say to my Democratic colleagues who will bemoan cuts in various domestic discretionary programs—and I will agree with them that some of those cuts are inappropriate—but how can we in the Congress justify adding funds for marginal projects in this bill while we are making those cuts in domestic discretionary programs? And I

would say to my Republican colleagues, many of whom, like the Senator from Arizona, feel the investment in defense is inadequate, is this the place where additional funding should be spent if we have additional funding to spend in defense?

I do not believe the American people want us to conduct business as usual. It is always striking to me that when the Defense authorization bill passes, and we generally make significant policy decisions in that Defense authorization bill, unfortunately, in our hometowns and in our home States the headlines in the local papers are about the military construction projects that are funded in the Defense bill. So I understand there is a local imperative that drives the funding of these military construction projects.

I do believe we need to at least hold the level of increase to the very substantial level that the administration has asked for and not add to it in this bill. The way we propose this legislation, it would be up to the Appropriations Committee to make a decision as to where the priority is and where it wants to spend that \$474 billion of add-ons. I have no argument with them on that. That is the nature of our committee structure, and I think they can make that decision.

If we do not stop business as usual in this bill, then where are we going to? Mr. President, \$474 million in add-ons is enough. I, for one, do not support going with an additional \$300 million above and beyond that. I hope a majority of the Senate will agree, after all of the speeches have been made on deficit reduction, that the message sent by adding \$774 million in add-ons is inappropriate, and the American people would not support it.

Let me conclude by just reading a short statement from the administration on this. The administration says in this statement of administration policy:

The Administration is committed to balancing the Federal budget by the [fiscal year] 2005. The President's budget proposes to reduce discretionary spending for [fiscal year] 1996 by \$5 billion in outlays below the FY 1995 level. The Administration does not support the level of funding assumed by the House or Senate Committee 602(b) allocations.

* * * * *

The Administration strongly objects to \$648 million in funding for approximately 100 unrequested military and family housing construction projects. With the Nation facing serious budget constraints, such a spending increase is not affordable.

Mr. President, let me also point out there is an item in here that I think people just need to be aware of. That is, this subcommittee of Appropriations has been given the job of funding, as I understand it, the renovation of the Pentagon. There is \$161 million in this bill for renovation of the Pentagon. I support that funding. Frankly, when I saw the figure, I was a little bit taken aback and thought maybe this is a bit excessive. I know that is a big

building, but \$161 million is a lot of renovation. Then I noticed in the bill, on page 20 of the bill, a provision which really did, I think, cause me to think we should focus on this. It says, "None of the funds appropriated in this act may be transferred to or obligated from the Pentagon reservation facility renovation unless the Secretary certifies that the total cost for planning, design, construction, installation of equipment for the renovation of the Pentagon will not exceed \$1.2 billion."

Mr. President, I thought the \$161 million was a little excessive. Now I understand the \$161 million is next year's installment on renovation of the Pentagon. It is \$1.2 billion which this committee is saying is the total that they are going to agree to provide.

So I make this point for my colleagues, just to make the point we are not being stingy with the military. This is not a case of the military being totally left unfunded. They are getting nearly a 20-percent increase from last year's funding in military construction. We are agreeing here to go up to \$1.2 billion to renovate the Pentagon. In our amendment, we are not in any way interfering with the addition of \$474 million of Member interest items. We are just saying, let us draw the line someplace, and that someplace ought to be at the level that the administration requested. That means we ought to strike \$300 million of those add-ons as part of this bill.

So that is a brief explanation. My colleagues from Arizona and Nevada wish to speak on this. I, therefore, reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New Mexico raises a couple of good points. If you look to see what we have done in the past, we have been very negligent in providing housing, especially for our enlisted personnel in the military. When we changed the philosophy on how we were to maintain our military forces, when we went to an all-military Army, Navy, and Marine force, we made a covenant with those people that if they are volunteering and they make this a career, we are going to provide some kind of quality of life. I think this is the first time that we have made an investment this large in the infrastructure for the quality of life for our enlisted people.

I was shocked when visiting some of the bases that we actually have people who are living off base, who have to go to lease a house, or rent a house, or even purchase a house. This has caused them to qualify for food stamps. I do not think this is very good when we ask those people to stand in harm's way for this country and to represent us in some areas where maybe some of us would refuse to go.

I am very much aware that for the first time we have changed the thrust of military construction.

Then let us look at another end of it. In the base closing and the realignment, we are trying to move some of the facilities that we have closed into private hands, to dispose of that property. But due to some environmental laws, like third-party liability, those properties are not worth anything until we clean those properties up. And that is where the big expense is coming in with base realignment. We have chosen to close military facilities to save money. We are having to shift some funds over into BRAC in order to close those facilities and make them available to either private sales or to be used for some other part of Government operations.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator from Montana if he would yield for a question?

Mr. BURNS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I want to be sure there was understanding between us. Our amendment does not cut any of the funds that are being appropriated to carry out the BRAC recommendations, either the previous BRAC recommendations or these BRAC recommendations. They are strictly add-ons in other areas and not in BRAC.

Mr. BURNS. I would respond to the Senator and say this: Because we had to use up so much money in that, we had to have money for the Guard and Reserves. The President's request had very little for the support of our Guard and Reserves and facilities around the country outside of the normal activity of our military because so much of the original request is taken up by base closure and realignment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me ask one additional question of my colleague. He understands also that our amendment does not interfere with the appropriation of \$474 million in add-ons which would totally satisfy the Guard money or Reserve money add-ons, as I understand it. What we are saying is that above and beyond, if the Appropriations Committee chose to give that a priority, there would be funding to do all the Guard and Reserves. It is just a question of whether or not we are going to add \$300 million more to that.

So I want to be sure that was clear, Mr. President.

Mr. BURNS. I appreciate the concerns of the Senator from New Mexico, but the shift of trying to direct our dollars into quality of life caused some of that in some areas.

So with that, I really believe that there is as much fairness and thrust in this bill as we could possibly have and still complete the mission of military construction.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCain addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator BURNS and Senator REID for a very fine piece of legislation. I would like to talk about some of the details of it. But the issue before us is the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. President, I support the Bingaman amendment. I want to just point out one simple fact. If you asked the military leadership in this country what their priorities are, "If you had \$300 million, what would you do with that money," I promise you, Mr. President, that military construction would be somewhere around seventh or eighth on their priority list. And the fact is that we add money for military construction because it helps us as Members of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, if I had \$300 million in addition, I would take it and modernize the force, I would provide more steaming hours and flying hours, and I would try to reduce the backlog of depot maintenance, which in some cases is 3 or 4 years. There are myriad uses that I could find for this money before military construction, and the military leadership in this country will tell you the same thing. If they had requested \$300 million in addition, it is nowhere to be found.

So, Mr. President, the point is that it is not that these are not good and worthwhile projects that the committee has earmarked for. In fact, they meet the criteria. And I want to congratulate Senator BURNS and Senator REID for adhering to the criteria that we have laid down in the authorizing committee and now has been adopted by the appropriating committee. It is not that they are not good projects. It is all a matter of priority as to where we spend the taxpayer dollars.

The Bingaman amendment, in my view, Mr. President, has nothing to do with the quality of the projects for which these moneys are being spent. It all has to do with the priorities of where we spend taxpayer dollars that are earmarked for defense.

This bill is \$300 million more than that requested by the President of the United States and requested by the Pentagon.

Mr. President, the issue is very much more complicated than that. I want to say again that Senator BURNS, Senator REID, and the subcommittee have come up with a good bill. They made progress over the last year, and begin to limit add-ons of unrequested military construction projects.

Last year, the Congress added over \$1 billion for specific unrequested military construction projects. This bill, although I believe it is too high in total, adds only about half of that amount.

I am particularly pleased that the committee apparently, as I mentioned, adhered to the stringent criteria adopted in last year's Defense authorization bill. And there are many laudable pro-

visions in the bill, including approval of the new family housing initiative; increased emphasis on environmental restoration funding for the BRAC accounts; no funding for the requested Army museum; they deleted land transfer language which was contained in the House bill; authorization for the Services to use barracks construction funding for renovation, if that would be a less costly alternative; and a specific requirement that all projects must be specifically authorized, since the bill contains projects which are not in the Senate version of the authorization bill.

Finally, I am particularly pleased that the Appropriations Committee chose to give more visibility to the ongoing efforts to renovate the Pentagon complex.

There are two areas where I am very disappointed in the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. First, the \$300 million add-on—and, as I repeat, I have not heard from one of the military service chiefs that military construction is their highest priority. And it is about time, I say to my colleagues, that we listen to the military as to their priority rather than our own.

Mr. President, at the full committee markup, an amendment was offered to add another \$250 million in unrequested projects to the military construction budget above the request and above the subcommittee's mark. I argued against the amendment at the time because I believed that these additional funds would be better used for higher priority requirements of our military service chiefs or to meet the must-pay bills for ongoing contingency operations. Secretary Perry requested \$1 billion in order to pay for ongoing contingencies which will not be canceled in the upcoming year. We authorized \$125 million, not the \$1 billion. That is one area where these additional add-ons could have gone.

Ultimately, the Armed Services Committee chose to authorize half that amount, an additional \$125 million of the total of \$7 billion added to the budget request for military construction above the total amount requested in these accounts. While all of these additional projects also met the established criteria, I continue to believe unrequested military construction projects should not be funded while validated military requirements go unfunded.

I will work very hard during floor consideration and conference with the House National Security Committee to limit the total amount of add-ons to not more than the level recommended by the Senate Armed Services Committee. Therefore, I urge the appropriators to make those reductions in the bill today in the form of the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. President, the bill language directs the Department of Defense to include funding in 1997 budget requests for three specific projects:

A new national range control center at White Sands missile range in New Mexico; a child development and galley facility at Fallon Naval Air Station in Nevada; and a new construction project at Fort Lawton, WA.

Mr. President, we do not need to do those kinds of things. Let us let the Pentagon make the recommendations themselves.

Mr. President, during this first year using the evaluation criteria for Member add-ons which was adopted last year, I have discovered an oversight which I hope to correct for next year's budget review. I intend to add to the established criteria a requirement that requests for add-ons be screened for priority against the relevant service's unfunded military construction priorities.

For this year's bills, I have asked my staff to work with the military services to verify that each of the unrequested military construction projects added by Congress are the next highest priority projects for the services. I also believe it would be useful for the Department of Defense to do their part and temporarily withhold obligation of funds for unrequested military construction projects which are determined to be low priority. I am preparing a letter to the Secretary of Defense suggesting that he request congressional approval to transfer any funds appropriated for low-priority projects to higher priority military construction projects.

Mr. President, the good news is that the total amount of military construction add-ons this year will be significantly less than the \$1 billion added last year. In just 1 year that is significant progress. The bad news is that when additional funds are available for defense, it is difficult to argue successfully that none of these additional funds should be spent for military construction projects. But even with the additional defense funding, must-pay bills and high-priority military requirements go unfunded. We still have a long way to go in the fight to eliminate unnecessary spending from the military construction bill.

I wish to congratulate Senator BURNS for a good bill and the fine work that he and his staff and Senator REID and his staff have done. We do not need the \$300 million in addition.

If the Bingaman amendment fails, then, Mr. President, I will be compelled to vote against the bill.

I urge all my colleagues to vote for the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). The Senator from Arizona has 1 minute 20 seconds.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time to Senator BINGAMAN.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. I yield 7½ minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to compliment Senator BURNS and Senator REID for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. They have done a good job.

In large part this military construction appropriations bill mirrors the construction priorities and criteria for projects established by the Armed Services Committee. I am particularly pleased by the emphasis placed on projects that will enhance the quality of life of the men and women in our military and on projects which will enhance the readiness of our Armed Forces. The bill also fully funds the base closure account request and provides the necessary funds to support environmental compliance projects. Both are areas which have historically been used as sources of funds for other projects.

Mr. President, I believe this is a sound bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Because I believe this is a good bill, I oppose the Bingaman-McCain amendment.

There should no longer be any doubt that the administration's proposed defense budget is underfunded. Although Secretary Perry increased funding for quality of life construction projects over the next 6 years by \$2.7 billion, there are very serious shortfalls in the Department's military construction programs. Let me identify just a few of the most startling:

According to the Congressional Research Service the current backlog of deferred maintenance and repair for family housing alone totals over \$2 billion; Air Force Housing units do not measure up to contemporary standards; 75 percent of the Army's family housing does not adequately meet Department of Defense Standards; 80 to 85 percent of the Army barracks do not meet current Department of Defense Standards; the Navy's current funding requirement for revitalization of family housing is \$1.7 billion; and, at current funding levels it would take over 40 years to eliminate the space and revitalization backlog for Navy and Marine Corps housing.

Mr. President, in addition to these startling figures, there are requirements for new mission facilities that are not being addressed in the administration's budget request. There are both active and reserve units which have been assigned new missions or new equipment but have not been provided the facilities to accomplish their new missions or support that equipment. This military construction appropriations bill provides for some of those shortfalls.

Because there are always allegations that some of the projects in the bill may be wasteful, I had my staff review

each project. They reported that to the best of their knowledge each project that is in this bill but not in the Armed Services Committee's bill meets the same rigorous criteria that Senator MCCAIN and Senator GLENN, the chairman and ranking member of the Readiness Subcommittee, impose on projects included in the Armed Services Committee's bill.

Mr. President, some of my colleagues may not appreciate the additional funding and construction projects included in this bill. However, I am confident that the men and women of our armed services and their families who will benefit from these projects will be most appreciative.

I ask my colleagues to support the bill and vote against the Bingaman-McCain amendment.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair and I thank the managers of the bill for giving me this opportunity.

I rise as a Senator from Missouri and, as important, as cochairman of the National Guard Caucus to register strong objections to this amendment. I appreciate very much the thoughtful comments of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I think his report on the review done by his staff on these projects should allay any fears that any of our colleagues may have about the projects in this bill.

As has already been noted, the Senate this year was again forced by the administration to make sure that defense infrastructure would be adequately funded. Active force infrastructure has traditionally been adequately funded, or at least better funded, whereas the National Guard forces traditionally have been underfunded. Why has it been this way, many have asked? The answer which is whispered through the halls of this building is that the Department of Defense relies on Congressmen and Senators to take care of the Guard. It is no accident that most of the people in the Pentagon are active military, and they realize that if they take care of their needs, they hope those of us who live in the real world will take care of our citizen soldiers. We have done so before. We are trying to do so now and we will in the future, because most of us—I think a significant majority of this body—care about the welfare and the readiness of the National Guard and the Air National Guard even if there are some who do not.

Now, this year the administration proposal funded the Army Guard infrastructure to the tune of \$18 million—\$18 million for the entire Army Guard infrastructure for all 50 States and Puerto Rico; \$18 million for the entire

Army Guard as against \$473 million for the Army, which in and of itself was shortchanged by some \$38 million by the administration.

If the Senators respect our citizen soldiers and the vitally important missions that they provide in our States, as well as in support of our national defense mission, then they must rectify this shoddy treatment of those who protect us.

My colleague from Montana, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and his ranking member, the Senator from Nevada, have done just that. They have done it with strict adherence to the rigorous set of standards for the necessary quality of life and readiness projects included in the mark of the bill that came out of the Appropriations Committee.

The Air National Guard received \$85 million, approximately half of the funding required for much-needed projects.

Let me state that in my State of Missouri, for instance, we had sought money, and this bill provides money, to improve sewer systems in order to ensure that our disaster relief headquarters, located at an Air National Guard facility, can be utilized during flood disasters. Do the sponsors of the amendment want to deny the citizens of Missouri adequate protection?

I found with great interest, as I looked on page 45 of this bill, that the State of New Mexico has this same kind of project. It happens to be that the storm drainage system and other storm drainage system provisions, two different provisions for New Mexico, are included because they happen to be at active bases.

I do not believe that our needs for disaster relief protection and services are any less because they happen to be at an Air National Guard facility rather than an active base.

The distinguished chairman of this committee considered each of the programs added to this military construction bill for the practicality of it being executed in fiscal year 1996, assured it was the highest priority for the base commanders and the National Guard tags, site availability, its inclusion in the FYDP and its overall quality of life and readiness importance. These are critically important projects, and I am very pleased that the managers of the bill decided to include these measures in this appropriations measure.

If any of my colleagues are thinking about voting for this amendment, let me assure you, it is to turn your back on our National Guard personnel. Currently, this is the only place we have to maintain the infrastructure readiness and the quality of life necessary to make sure our National Guard can function in its civil and national defense mission. We are trying to get the administration to acknowledge the Guard's requirements, but let us not hamstring our Guard for the administration's shortsightedness.

I urge my colleagues to support the managers of the bill and to defeat this amendment.

I yield the floor, and I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment to reduce funding in the military construction appropriation bill by \$300 million.

The committee used stringent criteria for producing this bill. As I understand them, projects were selected if they met one of the following minimum criteria.

The project is included in the Defense Department's future year's defense plan; the project can be executed in fiscal year 1996; the project is authorized in fiscal year 1996; or the project is the highest priority for the base.

Mr. President, I think these criteria are reasonable and I believe the subcommittee has done an excellent job in producing this bill.

The 1996 budget resolution provided an additional \$7 billion in budget authority and \$2 billion in outlays above what the President requested.

These additional funds can only be used for defense activities.

Certainly some of these funds should be used to adequately fund military construction and family housing projects which are key to readiness and quality of life for military personnel—and this is exactly what the Appropriations Committee did.

I urge my fellow Senators to vote against this amendment.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time at 10:20 be extended for 5 minutes; that the proponents of the bill have 5 minutes and those opposing the bill have 5 minutes and that will close debate. We will yield back the rest of that time.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on or in relation to the Bingaman amendment No. 1834 immediately following the stacked votes relating to the rescissions bill, which will begin at approximately 11 a.m. this morning.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Reserving the right to object, I just want to be sure I will get the opportunity to sum up and make the case for my amendment last.

Mr. REID. That is appropriate.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think the last two statements have told it all. I do not think anyone would consider the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina, a big spender. I do not

know of anyone in the history of the U.S. Senate that has had more of a reputation for watching where the pennies go than the Senator from South Carolina, and he has stated that this amendment should be resoundingly defeated.

We also have heard from the chairman of the National Guard Caucus and, in effect, he has also said that the Pentagon tends to protect its own and they do not really consider their own the National Guard and the Reserve component of the military. They would rather use the money on their own and, therefore, traditionally what they do is nothing regarding the Guard and Reserve. We for many years have had to be the spokesperson for the Guard and Reserve. That is not the way it should be, but that is the way it is. The Guard and Reserve deserve more than what this administration and what the Pentagon has given them in this budget and budgets gone by.

Mr. President, this add-on, as we call it, is not for anything that is lavish. What we are saying is that we believe that family housing is important. Family housing is important. We have people living in homes with their families, homes over 50 years old, built during the Second World War and built to last during that war. The war is long since gone and people are still living in those homes.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has announced, there are facilities in the United States where people cannot live on base. They are living off base. Because it costs so much money, they have to draw food stamps, even though they are part of the U.S. military. That is wrong.

We also are concerned in this bill about single soldier barracks. We think they deserve more. Facilities were constructed very rapidly during the Second World War and were to last through the war, and now 50 years later, soldiers are living in the same places. They deserve more.

We have been very frugal as it relates to officers housing. There were numerous requests for housing for general officers that we did not honor. We went and looked at family housing and single soldier barracks.

These add-ons are not a budget buster. All Members should understand, we are not busting any budget. We are totally within our 602(b) allocation, but we felt our Guard and Reserve deserve more than what they were given by the Pentagon and by this administration.

The committee evaluates rather than the Pentagon. It is as simple as that. That is not the way it should be, but, Mr. President, that is the way it is. The budget requested by the Department of Defense has, once again, in past years neglected to address the military construction needs of the National Guard, both Army and Air.

I say to the senior Senator from Arizona, there are lots of other places these moneys could be spent, but this is a Military Construction Subcommit-

tee budget and that is where we are obligated to spend the money, not on giving the Navy more days to practice their specialties in the water, doing all the things that the Senator from Arizona indicated should be done. We recognize there is a lot more need in the military, but in the Military Construction Subcommittee, we have put the money where it should best be spent. I have not heard anyone say these projects are not worthwhile. They are needed.

The administration requested only \$182 million for the Guard and Reserve, compared—listen to this—to \$574 million appropriated last year. This year's recommendation is 20 percent less than last year, \$452 million.

Also included in this bill, as I have indicated and as has been spoken by the Senator from New Mexico, is a \$161 million appropriation to begin renovation of the Pentagon. That, too, was put up earlier as part of the history of this country. It is badly in need of repair, and we are beginning that. That is also a burden on this budget.

This bill, I again indicate and emphasize, is a long-overlooked quality-of-life initiative, particularly in family housing and barracks. These initiatives make up nearly one-third of the total military construction markup.

We should be given some credit for that, Mr. President. These are not programs that are wasteful. The chairman of the full committee, the Armed Services Committee, has come here and said this is important. We must do a better job for the people that are defending our country. During times of crisis, the Guard and Reserve are called upon, and in the future, with the cutbacks we have had, they will be called upon even more. We must recognize that it is necessary to fund this bill as outlined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises that the manager's time has expired.

Mr. BINGAMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, am I correct that there is an additional 5 minutes reserved for me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me make the obvious point here that this is not a question of whether people support the military, or the National Guard, or family housing, or money for base realignment and closure. The President, in the budget sent to this Congress, asked for an increase of just about 20 percent in military construction from last year for military construction and family housing both.

There is a request for \$605 million—an additional \$605 million—for family housing, above what we had last year. There is over \$1.2 billion in additional funding to carry out base realignment and closure.

The amendment that I am offering in no way interferes with any of that

funding. The amendment that I am offering says that, in addition to what the President requested, the subcommittee can add \$474 million of add-ons. But they should not be able to go above that. It should not be \$774 million of add-ons. That is all I am saying. Let us keep the amount spent in this area within the confines of what the administration requested.

Mr. President, we have two standards in this Senate and in this Congress. It is one standard when it is military spending and a totally different standard when it is domestic spending. You are seeing a very good example of it in the arguments being made around here right now.

Deficit reduction was a big issue in this Senate last month. I remember lots of speeches last month, the month before that, and the month before that, about how we have to make tough decisions. The time has come, and business as usual cannot continue. The American people want some change; they do not want excessive spending in these areas. Well, that is what this amendment is about.

All this talk about the National Guard—all of the requests for the National Guard that are being funded could be funded in the \$474 million of add-ons that we are not in any way interfering with. The family housing—the \$605 million there—we are not interfering with that. The simple fact is, Mr. President, the additional \$300 million that is in this bill, which I am now proposing we strike, is not a priority for the military; it is not a priority for the country.

The Senate needs to go on record about whether we are serious about deficit reduction. We are very good at giving speeches, going home and saying, boy, we are really doing the right thing, and we are making the tough decisions. This is not that tough a decision, Mr. President. This is \$300 million that the military says is not a priority. There is no reason why we need to be going ahead and spending it. That is the simple issue.

I believe the taxpayers of this country would support our amendment to delete this \$300 million and have it available for a higher priority—military use, or have it able for some domestic use, which would be a higher priority—or apply it to deficit reduction, which is what the amendment calls for. It essentially says let us not spend that \$300 million which is not a priority.

So that is the amendment. I hope very much the Senate will support it. I think the people send us here to Congress to make tough decisions about what our priorities are. If deficit reduction is a priority, people ought to vote for this amendment.

I appreciate the chance to explain the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, one-third of this BRAC is living conditions, and

the rest of it is for readiness. We must never forget about that. By a previous order, this vote will come in the stack with the rescissions votes.

I move that this amendment be tabled, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how many votes are being stacked?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from West Virginia that according to this agreement, there would be four.

Mr. BYRD. Would there be an explanation of the vote just prior to taking that vote?

Mr. BURNS. I say to my friend from West Virginia, that has not been established. But I have no problem with that. Do we need a minute on each side?

Mr. BYRD. Four minutes equally divided, how about that?

Mr. BURNS. I have no problem with that.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE, FOR ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES, FOR ASSISTANCE IN THE RECOVERY FROM THE TRAGEDY THAT OCCURRED AT OKLAHOMA CITY, AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 1944, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1944) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Wellstone/Moseley-Braun Amendment No. 1833, to strike certain rescissions, and to provide an offset.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, first of all, I would like to take this occasion to thank Senators WELLSTONE and MOSELEY-BRAUN, the minority leader, the majority leader, the White House, and all the participants who have sought to resolve this issue and bring this to a vote on the rescissions package. I also thank Senator BYRD, as our ranking member of this subcommittee, for giving leadership in every instance of this committee's activity. And I especially want to thank Senator BYRD for his participation, as well.

Mr. President, the Wellstone amendment adds back \$651 million into the rescissions package, or reduces rescissions by that figure; \$332 million for 8 education and job training programs; and \$319 million for the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program.

These add-backs are over and above the levels for these programs negotiated with the President of the United States, the White House, the House of Representatives and the Senate, as well, and this includes the Democratic leadership of both the House and Senate.

In the case of youth training, education technology, and the Eisenhower Professional Development Programs, the add-backs in the Wellstone amendment exceed the levels agreed to in the so-called Dole-Daschle compromise. That was back when the rescissions package was being acted upon by the Senate. And the Dole-Daschle compromise became our point of reference, our guidelines in the conference with the House of Representatives. That was the original rescissions package.

Let me emphasize again that in those areas, the Wellstone amendment exceeds those levels that this Senate passed. The provisions of H.R. 1944 are the product of extensive negotiations over several months.

To add back funding for these programs at this time jeopardizes the enactment of this bill. I say that because of the fact that if we change this bill, it goes back to the House of Representatives again for an action, and if the House of Representatives refuses to adopt any changes that we have made in this rescissions package at this time, they can demand a conference, and we would be back into that process of a conference. Notwithstanding that, we would be thrown back in the situation of negotiating again with the White House, who vetoed the first bill.

To add back funding for these programs at this particular time jeopardizes the enactment of this bill, which is an emergency supplement to assist in providing for disaster assistance, for antiterrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery of the tragedy that occurred in Oklahoma City, and for making rescissions.

Additionally, the Wellstone amendment jeopardizes funding for fiscal year 1996 for the very programs he seeks to protect. Without enactment of H.R. 1944, the Labor-HHS and Education subcommittee alone will be forced to absorb an additional \$3 billion in budget authority and \$1.3 billion in outlays within its already reduced allocations for 1996, because of the reduced budget resolution.

The committee already has a tough job ahead. Adoption of the Wellstone amendment would make that job even more difficult by putting off until another day on reducing the growth of Federal spending.

Mr. President, how many minutes did I use?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The manager has 5 minutes and 40 seconds.