

that has been proposed eliminates the drug addiction and alcoholism disabilities from SSI. The Democrats are silent. President Clinton is silent on this issue. On issues as important as these, silence is death.

We have been down the road of half measures before. It was called the 1988 Family Support Act. It made big promises. It was going to put people to work. We had hoped, with the so-called Welfare Reform Act of 1988, that the devotion of additional resources, that additional Washington management, that additional one-size-fits-all solutions from the Nation's Capital would somehow provide a solution to the problem. But if we take a good look at what has happened in terms of welfare spending, we did not solve the problem in 1988. The problem skyrocketed in 1988. Half measures, the rearrangement of the deck chairs on the welfare *Titanic*, will do no more than provide a basis for taking the line on this chart right off the page.

We need to have real reform. We need to understand that welfare that is simply the Federal Government's handing individuals a wad of money, like the welfare reform proposal made available to Mr. Hill, is not welfare reform. That is welfare entrapment. We need to be involved in welfare replacement.

We must do more, we must ask for more, we must involve more people in the program. We must ask that civic groups and nongovernmental organizations be allowed to work with States. We must send the resources to the States to give them flexibility. The idea that there is a single solution in Washington that will provide the opportunity for everyone everywhere is an idea that has been proven to be a failure.

My family has an average size. If we were to try to buy pajamas based on the average size, one-size-fits-all would translate into one-size-fits-none.

When the Government in Washington, DC, tries to have a one-size-fits-all solution, it frequently fits none. It is time for us to turn the opportunity over to the States, States that can involve institutions that care for people, States that have the courage to make basic reforms, States that will have the courage to say to those on drugs and alcohol, "We will not continue to support your habit."

The real costs of welfare are not just the costs that we face as a result of the budget crunch. They are the costs in terms of human tragedy, costs like those endured by the Hill family as a result of the fact that, as a Government, we have chosen to fund one's addiction rather than to provide the kind of care that would help an individual leave the welfare system and become a productive individual.

This Saturday we will begin the welfare debate. We will have the opportunity to make a decision to pull together the information which will lead us to an inevitable conclusion that the one-size-fits-all Washington system has

failed. We will have the opportunity to give the States, which have been begging for decades now, the flexibility to do what works, to give them the resources through block grants, to allow them to make the kinds of changes and to have the kinds of conditions and requirements that will lift people by enlisting nongovernmental organizations and others in their communities to help individuals on welfare become productive members of our cities and towns.

It is with this in mind that we need to understand that welfare reform cannot be tinkering around the edges. It must be substantial. It must be real renovation and reformation, for without renovation and reformation in the system, we will not have a new opportunity for the citizens of the land. Indeed, that is what citizens who now are on welfare desperately need.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

---

#### NOT THE TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the statement by the Senator from Missouri related to welfare reform. I think that is one thing that this country is looking forward to. But I do object to no morning business. Now we have not had morning business, or been allowed morning business for over a week. We come in here on a defense authorization bill and we take 10 minutes to talk about welfare reform. I am sitting here trying to get an amendment on the bill.

So we have morning business periodically during the day. That is fine. This is prime time, and I know it is a lot better than 8 o'clock in the morning or 9 o'clock in the morning. But we have a Defense authorization bill here. I would like to get that done. We are going to have welfare reform. You can talk all day Saturday if you want to, about welfare reform.

As I say, I have enjoyed what the Senator said. I appreciate what he is trying to do. But we are also trying to get a Defense authorization bill through, and I think we ought either to have morning business and do it then, or we should have morning business late in the evening, instead of going through and interrupting the flow of business in the Senate.

I thank the Chair and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

---

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, the cold war is over, and in some ways we all long for the old certainties it provided. The Armed Services Committee has grappled with the difficult task of matching our national security interests to the new realities of international politics, and I commend them for their hard work in this area.

But I also want to take this opportunity to express serious concern about certain provisions in this legislation which, in my view, would discard a generation of progress toward arms control that serves our national security needs.

In terms of arms control—and, in terms of our Nation's solemn commitment to its treaty obligations—I have strong reservations about the paths charted by the committee legislation. I hope the Senate fully appreciates the weight and implications of proposals now before us.

I know that there are some negotiations that are going on regarding language, and I am pleased to hear that.

By my count, this legislation puts at risk at least four important arms control agreements. It puts us on a path toward abrogating two treaties which the United States has ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate—agreements which, in accordance with the processes of our Constitution, our Nation has pledged to honor. It also takes policy steps that may jeopardize our chances to successfully conclude and implement at least two other important agreements that our Nation long has pursued.

The stakes are high:

The Anti-Ballistic Missile [ABM] Treaty has been in force in the United States since 1972. This bill would put us on a path to abrogate the ABM treaty by setting a date to deploy national ballistic missile defenses and by unilaterally imposing a line of demarcation to separate ballistic missile defenses, which are covered by the treaty, from theater defense systems, which are not. This important demarcation issue is the subject of ongoing negotiations—and, yet, this bill would have us act alone. Perhaps, as its critics suggest, the ABM Treaty no longer serves our national interests. But if that is so, we should review our commitment to the treaty through a deliberate process—we should not simply take steps toward no longer complying.

The safeguards agreement between the United States and the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] has been in force since 1980.

This is another aspect of language in the agreement that I find troubling, and perhaps this has been addressed.

This legislation would walk away from that agreement by setting unrealistic criteria that must be met before any IAEA safeguards inspection

can take place. When the Senate ratified the safeguards agreement, we believed that placing many of America's nuclear materials under safeguards would strengthen our ability to press other countries to accept safeguards as well. Our national interests are well served when other countries accept safeguards, and our interests are at risk when safeguards are rejected, as we have learned bitterly in Iraq and in North Korea. If the Senate today walks away from our safeguards commitment, what message are we sending to those whose nuclear ambitions we oppose?

The third concern I have is that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty [CTBT] to ban nuclear testing is on schedule for completion in 1996. Our negotiators have pursued this agreement for decades, and their hand was significantly strengthened by the decision of the United States during the Bush administration to impose a moratorium on our own nuclear tests. Yet, this legislation would commit funds to prepare the United States to resume testing, even before our own self-declared testing moratorium has expired. If we take this step, we will signal to the world that we are not serious about a test ban, and we will put the treaty's successful conclusion in serious jeopardy.

Finally, we all are aware of the importance of START II, the basic agreement for implementing President Reagan's vision of deep cuts in the strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and the former Soviet Union. The treaty now is pending before the Senate and before the Russian Parliament for ratification. Yet, the legislation before us today would halt for at least a year the retirement of U.S. strategic nuclear weapons, would substantially restructure our nuclear forces to retain greater capacity, and would strengthen our ability to quickly reconstruct weapons in excess of our treaty commitment. At a time when hard-line elements in the Russian Parliament are searching for reasons to kill the START II treaty—and when certain elements in Russia have stated clearly that they expect the United States to adhere to its commitments under the ABM treaty—any actions such as those proposed in this legislation would, I fear, significantly diminish the prospects for Russian ratification of the treaty.

Perhaps this again is something that we do not want to undertake at this time. But I think that we ought to have then a more full-blown discussion

of the importance of the START II treaty.

Mr. President, I will oppose efforts that endanger these important agreements that serve the interests of our Nation. The provisions I have discussed do not serve our national security or foreign policy interests. I believe in a strong national defense, but I also believe that arms control has a place in America's national security strategy and that America should not lightly abandon its solemn treaty obligations. I urge my colleagues to think long and hard before proceeding with the courses of action this bill proposes.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Kansas for her remarks. And I made remarks this morning and went over most of the same items and expressed many—not all but many—of the same concerns, particularly in relationship between what I call an anticipatory breach of the ABM Treaty which is in this bill, and the relationship between that and the START treaties which are pending. But not only that; the START I Treaty which has not completely been implemented.

I think it would be the height of folly if we end up increasing the threat that would otherwise be aimed at the United States by doing something in a bill that prevents the deep reductions that are taking place in both START I and START II.

So I share the views of the Senator from Kansas on this. I think she is on point.

I also share the concerns she has expressed about prematurely going back into manufacturing of nuclear weapons where we have not had decisions made yet by DOE on that point. I believe in prodding DOE to make sure we have nuclear safety and security. But I think we are making decisions in this bill that go too far at this time.

It is my hope that we will be able to have amendments that will iron out each of these problems as we go through this bill. And on the ABM question, the question that the Senator from Kansas raised, we will have at least two or three amendments tomorrow—early, I hope—on those key questions because she has identified I think the major concerns with this bill.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if I may, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Georgia. I was in a markup all morning and did not hear his speech. I have the highest regard for the chairman, Senator THURMOND, and the ranking leader of Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN. I know

they know these issues well, and have great dedication to them.

I appreciate the Senator's comments.

Mr. NUNN. I have learned over the years that the Senator from Kansas does not necessarily need to listen to any of my speeches in order to come to the right conclusion.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, could I say to my distinguished colleague that I was not able to be present throughout the presentation of her statement. But I know it addressed several provisions that I was the author of in the bill. I will have an opportunity tomorrow after examining the statement in full, Mr. President, to reply I hope in full and perhaps to the satisfaction of my distinguished colleague.

AMENDMENT NO. 2084

(Purpose: To authorize additional military construction projects)

Mr. THURMOND. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), for himself, Mr. BURNS, Mr. REID, Mr. FORD, Mr. BOND, and Mr. NUNN, proposes an amendment numbered 2084.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 404, in the table following line 10, insert before the item relating to Fort Knox, Kentucky, the following project in Kentucky:

	Fort Campbell .....	\$10,000,000
--	---------------------	--------------

On page 405, in the table following line 2, insert after the item relating to Camp Stanley, Korea, the following:

	Yongsan .....	\$4,500,000
--	---------------	-------------

On page 406, line 14, strike out "\$2,019,358,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,033,858,000".

On page 406, line 17, strike out "\$396,380,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$406,380,000".

On page 406, line 20, strike out "\$98,050,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$102,550,000".

On page 408, in the table following line 4, in the item relating to Bremerton Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Washington, strike out "\$9,470,000" in the amount column and insert in lieu thereof "\$19,870,000".

On page 410, in the table preceding line 1, add after the item relating to Norfolk Public Works Center, Virginia, the following new items:

Washington .....	Bangor Naval Submarine Base .....	141 units .....	\$4,890,000
West Virginia .....	Naval Security Group Detachment, Sugar Grove .....	23 units .....	\$3,590,000

On page 411, line 6, strike out "\$2,058,579,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,077,459,000".

On page 411, line 9, strike out "\$389,259,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$399,659,000".

On page 412, line 3, strike out "\$477,767,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$486,247,000".

On page 415, in the table following line 18, in the item relating to Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, strike out "\$3,700,000" in the amount column and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,200,000".

On page 415, in the table following line 18, in the item relating to Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, strike out "\$3,850,000" in the

amount column and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,850,000".

On page 416, in the table preceding line 1, in the item relating to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, strike out "\$18,650,000" in the amount column and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,350,000".

On page 416, in the table preceding line 1, in the item relating to McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, strike out "\$9,200,000" in the amount column and insert in lieu thereof "\$16,500,000".

On page 416, in the table preceding line 1, insert after the item relating to Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, the following:

	Holloman Air Force Base.	\$6,000,000
--	--------------------------	-------------

On page 416, in the table preceding line 1, insert after the item relating to Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, the following:

South Dakota ...	Ellsworth Air Force Base.	\$7,800,000
------------------	---------------------------	-------------

On page 416, in the table preceding line 1, in the item relating to Hill Air Force Base, Utah, strike out "\$8,900,000" in the amount column and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,600,000".

On page 418, in the table preceding line 1, insert after the item relating to Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, the following:

	Nellis Air Force Base.	57 units .	\$6,000,000
--	------------------------	------------	-------------

On page 419, line 17, strike out "\$1,697,704,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,740,704,000".

On page 419, line 21, strike out "\$473,116,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$510,116,000".

On page 420, line 10, strike out "\$281,965,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$287,965,000".

On page 421, in the table following line 10, in the matter relating to Defense Medical Facilities Offices, insert before the item relating to Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, the following:

	Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.	\$10,000,000
--	----------------------------------	--------------

On page 422, in the table preceding line 1, in the matter relating to the Special Operations Command at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, strike out "\$2,600,000" in the amount column and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,100,000".

On page 424, line 22, strike out "\$4,565,533,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,581,033,000".

On page 424, line 25, strike out "\$300,644,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$316,144,000".

On page 429, line 14, strike out "\$85,353,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$148,589,000".

On page 429, line 15, strike out "\$44,613,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$79,895,000".

On page 429, line 19, strike out "\$132,953,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$167,503,000".

On page 429, line 22, strike out "\$31,982,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$35,132,000".

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senator NUNN, the ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Senators BURNS and REID, the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction and Senators BOND and FORD in sponsoring this amendment which authorizes an additional \$228 million for construction projects which are currently appropriated in the military construction appropriations bill for 1996. The amendment would authorize an additional 46 projects to enhance the readiness of our Armed Forces and improve the living and working conditions of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines across the country.

Mr. President, last Friday, I spoke against an amendment to the military construction bill that would have reduced the funding in the bill by \$300 million. I will not repeat all the arguments I propounded at that time, other than to say that all the services acknowledge they have a significant shortfall and backlog in the repair and maintenance of the facilities. The facts also indicate that in excess of 70 percent of the family and unaccompanied housing does not currently meet Department of Defense standards.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the additional projects authorized be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State/Country	Service	Installation name	Project title	(thousands)
Kentucky	Army	Ft. Campbell	Whole Barracks Renewal, ph I	10,000
Korea	do	Yongsan	Child Development Center	4,500
Total				14,500
Washington	Navy-FH	Bangor Naval Sub Base	141 Units	4,890
Do	Navy	Puget Sound Naval Ship	Physical Fitness Center	10,400
West Virginia	Navy-FH	Sugar Grove NSDG	23 Units	3,590
Total				18,800
Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	Computer Software Facility	1,500
Alaska	do	Eielson AFB	Boiler Rehabilitation	4,000
Idaho	do	Mountain Home FB	Base Civil Engineering Warehouse	1,800
Do	do	do	Avionics Shop	4,900
Nevada	Air Force-FH	Nellis AFB	57 Units	6,000
New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Dormitory	7,300
New Mexico	do	Holloman AFB	Learning Center	6,000
South Dakota	do	Ellsworth AFB	Consolidated Administrative Support Complex	7,800
Utah	do	Hill Air Force Base	Depot Fire Protection	3,700
Total				43,000
Alabama	Defense Agencies	Maxwell AFB	Ambulatory Healthcare Center, phase I	10,000
North Carolina	do	Fort Bragg	SOF Barracks	5,500
Total				15,500
Arkansas	Army National Guard	Camp Robinson	Military Operations in Urban Trg Facility	2,853
Florida	do	Camp Blanding	Wastewater Treatment Plant, Phase II	5,300
Do	do	do	Water Distribution System Upgrade	4,200
Louisiana	do	Plaquemine	OMS rehabilitation/renovation	776
Do	do	Ruston	OMS	1,638
Maryland	do	Camp Fretard	do	2,700
Minnesota	do	Camp Ripley	CSMS, ph II	8,150
Mississippi	do	Camp Shelby	Multipurpose Range Complex, ph I	5,000
Missouri	do	Jefferson City	Multipurpose Baffle Range	2,236
Montana	do	Ft. Harrison	Training Site Support Facility	7,854
Nebraska	do	Hastings Training Range	Instructional Facility	761
Oregon	do	Camp Withycombe	CSMS	4,769
Do	do	Salem	Airfield Operations Building	2,972
Tennessee	do	Johnson City	OMS, AMSA & VMF	1,937
Utah	do	Camp Williams	Replace/Upgrade Portable Water Distrib. Syste	800
Wisconsin	do	West Bend	Army Aviatio Complex	5,235
Wyoming	do	Camp Guernsey	Utility Upgrade	6,055
Total				63,236
Kansas	Army Reserve	Witchita	HQ 89th ARCOM	8,389
Nevada	do	Las Vegas	Armed Forces Reserve Center/OMS	9,000
New Hampshire	do	Manchester	AFRC/AMSA/OMS	17,893
Total				35,282
Alaska	Air National Guard	Eielson AFB	Aircraft Engine Shop	2,550
Do	do	do	Base Engineer Maintenance Facility	4,400
Arkansas	do	Little Rock AFB	Base Supply Complex	4,800
Iowa	do	Sioux City Gateway AP	Upgrade Access Taxiway	750
Kansas	do	McConnell AFB	B-1 Fuel Maintenance Hangar	7,900
Missouri	do	Jefferson Barracks	Upgrade Sewer System	2,700
South Dakota	do	Joe Foss Field	Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Complex	4,400
Tennessee	do	McGhee Tyson Airport	Squadron Operations Facility	4,400

State/Country	Service	Installation name	Project title	(thousands)
Vermont	.....do	Burlington Airport	Add/Alter Operations and Training Facility	2,650
Total				34,550
Colorado	Air Force Reserve	Peterson AFB	Composite Maintenance Facility	3,150
				3,150
Grand Total				228,098

Mr. THURMOND. I further ask that because the Senate has previously approved these projects by an overwhelming vote of 84 to 10, we can agree to a time limit on the debate and a vote on this amendment.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, this is a military construction amendment which we have discussed. This amendment has been worked carefully on both sides of the aisle, with Senator THURMOND's staff and my staff and the staff of other members of the committee, and I am in favor of this amendment and certainly hope it will pass.

It is my understanding that each of these projects meet the committee criteria. Those criteria are that it has to be a part of the 5-year defense plan of the Department of Defense. So these are high-priority projects. They must be the highest priority in the State or the base in question. Each one of the projects must be executable in fiscal year 1996. It must be consistent with the BRAC process and they must be mission essential.

So this is a list of projects for which the appropriators have already appropriated the money. It fits within the 602(b) funding allocation, and this would make the authorization committee and the Appropriations Committee in sync as I understand it. So I think that this amendment should be accepted. I hope it will be accepted.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I understand the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] will be in a little bit to speak against this amendment. I wanted to make that announcement now.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I just wanted to clarify, if I could, exactly what the amendment is and then make a short statement.

Am I correct, if I could address a question to the chairman or ranking member, either one, this amendment brings up the amount of funds authorized for military construction to the level that we decided to appropriate to last week in the appropriations bill? Is that essentially what is being done here?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, that is correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Am I also correct that the level of funding for military construction this year in this bill, the 1996 authorization bill as requested by the administration, was about \$2 billion over what was requested and appropriated in the 1995 bill?

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Am I also correct that what we are essentially doing here

is authorizing what the House has already appropriated, or the House appropriation/authorization provides, and that is about \$500 million more than the administration request?

Mr. THURMOND. They appropriated \$500 million. We are only appropriating here about \$300 million.

Mr. BINGAMAN. We are going above the administration's request by this amount, is that correct?

Mr. THURMOND. Correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I appreciate the Senator's responses very much.

Mr. President, this is the same vote we cast last week where I indicated my opposition to adding additional money. I think the figures we had last week were that we were adding \$474 million to what was requested by the administration, and in addition another \$300 million. I tried to persuade my colleagues to not add the additional \$300 million and was unsuccessful. We had a vote on it.

I understand that the Senate supports the amendment that the Senator from South Carolina is offering here, and I will not ask for a rollcall vote, but I would like the record to show that I oppose the amendment and have me recorded in opposition at the time this is voted by voice.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Senator MCCAIN I believe is ready now.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it is with disappointment that I come to the floor. I do not know where my colleagues have been lately. I do not know if they have been seeing what is being written in the newspapers and editorials all over America about spending too much money on unneeded projects out of defense dollars.

You know what we are running the danger of here? We are running the danger of losing support for defense spending if we keep this up, if we keep spending money on things that we do not need.

If the chairman and the distinguished ranking member of this committee can find me one military leader, one military leader that would come over and say this \$228 million is a priority, I would like to meet that person. What they will say, if you ask the military leaders what they need the money for, they will say they need it for depot maintenance; they will say they need it for force modernization, they need it for readiness, more ammunition. I can give you 20 things, 20 priorities that rank above more military construction.

My colleague from New Mexico last week tried to stop additional military construction money. We got a total of 17 votes, or was it 19? I do not remember. Seventeen votes. It is a little embarrassing to lose a vote by that much. But this is wrong. This is wrong.

I do not understand who we think we are kidding here. We have 54,000 young men, military families today on food stamps—on food stamps—and we are going to build more MilCon. Before the subcommittee, of which I am the Chair, the outgoing Commandant of the Marine Corps said the following. He said, yes, we want our military families to live in good housing, but I do not want the widow of a Marine living in a good house when we come to tell her that her husband has been killed because we did not supply him with the right equipment.

That is what the Commandant of the Marine Corps said. What he was saying was that they have a higher priority, they have a number of higher priorities than additional MilCon.

The Senate appropriators added a great deal already, \$200 million, in response to the request of the Secretary of Defense that we improve the standard of living and the military housing situation for both married and unmarried military personnel. And we did that. And they were pleased.

Then we added another \$125 million in the markup. Now we are adding another \$228 million. I guess my question to the chairman and ranking member is, how much is enough? How much is enough? If I sound frustrated by this, it is because I continuously talk to people in the military who say to me: What are you guys doing adding all this MilCon money? I get that from captains and lieutenants and majors and lieutenant commanders. They say, why is it—we have a depot maintenance backlog of 3 and 4 years, and yet you guys keep adding MilCon money.

I have been around this body long enough to know, Mr. President, where the votes lie.

I have been around this body to know that we would probably get another 17 votes if a recorded vote on this was called for. And I do not particularly feel like putting the body through this drill. But I want to tell you, Mr. President, I want to tell you in all sincerity, more and more and more stories are coming out about defense pork. And the confidence and commitment of the American people for us to spend money on defense where it is truly needed is getting less and less and less. So, I guess—I do not know if the ranking member can answer, the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I would like to

ask him, How much is enough? How much MilCon money is enough? But I guess there is not any answer because there may not be enough. Because if there is another billion or couple million, we will probably put it in MilCon.

So I want to strongly object to this. I think it is wrong. I think that there are other priorities. Those have been made clear time after time by our military leaders. And we are making a serious mistake because the time is going to come when we really need to spend some money on defense or some project and we will have lost the confidence of the American people in our ability to spend those funds wisely.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I hope that my colleague from Arizona will understand that there are some of us that just sincerely disagree with him—and I will be glad to yield to the Senator—that we disagree and sincerely disagree. And so I hope that somehow or other we can look at the defense of our country in another light.

Now, this MilCon, as I understand it, met the criteria of the mission essential. It met the criteria of highest priority. And, Mr. President, one of the things we see as we downsize, we must support and improve the position of our Reserve, our National Guard. We have 66 Members of this Senate that are members of the National Guard Caucus. When we go back home we see the 130-H's and see them in Panama or Somalia or Bosnia and those places. Those are the National Guard. Those are the ones we want to train. These are the people in this MilCon that we are trying to support. So we are trying to strengthen the National Guard and give them the kind of training centers, the ranges, those things that would make them better military personnel.

And I understand that you do not want to go to a fine house and talk to a widow. But I also understand that if you are going to have quality personnel in the military, if you are going to continue to get, keep and recruit high-quality personnel, then we have to have a quality of life for the military personnel. And housing is one of the most important things that you can do.

And so, Mr. President, under this bill we have an appropriated amount. And we voted on that, 80-some-odd votes approving this particular amendment.

Now, we want to approve this amendment in the authorization part of the DOD bill. And I think it is only fair that we put it in the authorization now so that we can go on with supporting the quality of life of our military personnel, to strengthen the National Guard and the Reserve to meet our highest priority and mission essential. So I hope that we will vigorously support this amendment as I believe and sincerely believe it is in our best interest in the defense of our country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GLENN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am glad that we are using the criteria that we established in the Readiness Subcommittee on the Armed Services Committee over the last couple of years, the criteria for setting the ground rules for how we move forward on items like this. I must, however, join my friends, Senator MCCAIN and Senator BINGAMAN, in their concerns about what we are doing. I recognize fully that we did vote for the appropriations bill last week that had these things in it, but it was done on the contingency, as I understand it, that we pass the authorization. Senator BINGAMAN disapproved of it then and wanted to move that money out of that appropriations bill and into contingency operations. And I supported that amendment of his.

Now we have \$228 million we seem to have found here. It seems to me that that money would be better spent for what Secretary of Defense Perry has called one of his highest priorities; that is, getting the money to pay for Bosnia and Iraq and the other operations that we have going all around the world. So it would lessen the amount they would have to come up in the supplemental one of these days.

The criteria that were established says that if an item is on the FYDP, the 5-year defense plan, that we can move it forward. But one of the hurdles that would have to be jumped would be that one of having it on the 5-year defense plan. As I understand it, all of these items that are on the proposal for the \$228 million expenditure do comply with those criteria being on that plan.

However, to me, we have so many other things that we are contending with on the defense budget this year. We have depot maintenance that is required. We are shortchanging that. We are shortchanging military housing. We are shortchanging a lot of other things and, in effect, moving these items forward to a higher priority than some of those items. We are moving things forward on what was going to be taken care of somewhere out in the 5-year defense plan.

We are moving it forward basically because some Members want these things in their districts, as I see it. And I can appreciate that. I have no quarrel with people wanting things in their particular districts or their particular States. But I just think that we are getting our priorities a little bit out of line when we move things forward on that 5-year defense plan and move them ahead of other requirements that I think are much more pressing than most of the things that this \$228 million would be spent for.

So I appreciate the fact that we are using the criteria that has been established. I do not think we are setting our priorities right, though, when we

move this \$228 million ahead of some of the other priorities where money is more desperately needed in the defense budget than for these items. I realize they have already been put through the appropriations process. But I think they are wrong. And I would follow my colleagues earlier and ask that, if this is to be passed on a voice vote—I am not asking for a rollcall vote on this; I do not believe that has been done—but I would follow the lead of Senator BINGAMAN and say, if there is to be a voice vote, I wish to be recorded against it. I know that will be probably a losing effort. But I think that we have to stand up on some of these things. We have established a pattern in the Armed Services Committee of opposing some of these things the last couple of years. And I would want to do the same thing here even though we did pass the appropriations bill a week or so ago. So I would ask that, if there is a voice vote on this, that I be recorded in opposition.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. I would just like to point out to the Senator from Ohio—and I appreciate his leadership in this area and his remarks—that there are a number of these projects that are family housing projects. There are a number of these projects that are barracks. That was one of the high priorities that was mentioned. That is one of the things we talked about. There are three of these projects that are day-care centers and fitness centers. We are talking about high-quality, priority projects. None of these have been drawn out of the air. As I understand it, all of them are on the 5-year priority list for the defense plan.

I think people ought to understand, as we hear this talk about waste and so forth, that the reason the military construction add-ons are having to occur here is because the administration itself has requested a whole lot less money in military construction over the last couple of years because the BRAC process was going on. We now know what happened in BRAC. We did not know that, the administration did not know that, when they submitted their defense budget this year or last year. So that defense request, that is going to be the measurement.

If anything is going to be labeled waste that goes over the administration request in military construction, I think that is really a misleading kind of portrayal, because the BRAC process was ongoing when the administration put the budget together. They did not request a number of projects that are now high-priority projects. An awful lot of this money is going to barracks and to housing and to daycare, and to quality-of-life projects. We have one project on here, for instance, in Joe Foss Field in South Dakota, a World War II facility, a vehicle maintenance and storage complex. It is of World War II vintage. And it does not meet the

fire and safety standards. It is in violation.

So I think people ought to be very careful and look at this on a project-by-project basis. I know the Senator from Ohio has done that, or will do that. But an awful lot of this effort here goes directly to the very areas that are a priority.

Mr. GLENN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NUNN. Yes.

Mr. GLENN. I do not quarrel with the fact that some of the funding in this goes to MilCon projects that are good and under the 5-year plan would be fine. But if we found \$228 million to spend, it seems to me if we want to spend that on MilCon projects, we should have gone back to the Defense Department and said, where do you need it most, where are the worst barracks, where are the people living in the most intolerable conditions, and let them prioritize where the greatest needs are.

I submit most of these items were placed back on this agenda and moved ahead on the 5-year plan because of a personal interest of a particular Senator, and this was not done on a priority basis where the greatest needs are in the military. That is my objection to it.

I know that we followed some of the criteria on the 5-year defense plan that we used as one of our criteria. I think if we can find this kind of money, it should be put to use in places where the Pentagon says they need it most, not just in those areas where the Members were getting something back for their particular States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I want to thank my ranking minority member on the subcommittee because we worked together on this. I want to assure the Senators, not only did we follow the criteria, but the suggestions of the different services that appeared before our committee. This is where they wanted housing built. This is where they wanted the construction.

We increased family housing \$111 million, in family housing alone, and this touches every service. There is no one service, but these were the high priority units requested by each of the services. We have a total deficit of 273,000 units which are inadequate or entirely unavailable.

When we went to the all-volunteer Army, in all the services, we changed our relationship with our military personnel.

As my friend from Arizona pointed out, he is hearing from captains and lieutenants about the construction, "Why are we getting this money?" I will tell you that there is not a lot of it that is going into officer's quarters. If you will look at where this money is going, it is going to the enlisted personnel. We have a deficit of barrack spaces. We are 161,000 units short of that.

Then Dr. Perry, when we talked to him, the Secretary of Defense, said, "I have a new housing initiative, but give me a little money and I can lever in the private sector."

He wants a pilot program on that to see if it will work on off-base housing for some of our married personnel. We gave that to Dr. Perry because it is very high on his priority list.

He said maybe we can double the availability of housing that we have. So when I say that my friend from Nevada and I, when we had the hearings and our staffs got together—and there has been nobody better to work with on this committee in trying to prioritize what we do with this money than Senator REID—we know that the BRAC has taken a lot more money out of MilCon than we first thought it ever would, because of the environmental cleanup. We are not through that yet. In fact, we do not really know what the bottom line is going to be on that or what the cost is going to be before these bases that are being closed and bases are being realigned, before those bases become available and can be moved into the private sector, because right now they have no value to us at all until we complete the mission of environmental cleanup.

So when we look at the totality of what we have, the dollars are very well invested and all meet the criteria that was set forth by the Armed Services Committee.

I want to thank the Armed Services Committee, because they have done an excellent job in setting priorities on this particular piece of legislation.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind comments of the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Montana.

I support this amendment that has been offered by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Mr. President, this conforms the military construction projects in the authorization bill to those already approved by the Senate in the military construction appropriations bill. I am a cosponsor of this amendment and hope the Senate will support it as strongly as it did, an identical provision, by a vote of 77 to 18 a week or so ago when we considered the military construction appropriations bill.

Mr. President, these projects are critical, worthy, well-scrubbed, quality-of-life projects which are needed in this era of an all-volunteer force. The chairman of the subcommittee very well outlined how our military force has changed. We depend much more today than we did 5 years ago, 10 years ago on a Reserve and Guard component, as we should. Any suggestion, as indicated by the senior Senator from Ohio in his remarks just a short time ago, that military housing is shortchanged is cer-

tainly true. That is what we are trying to rectify partially in this bill, and this amendment will allow us to do that.

Military housing has been short-changed. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. We built many homes for the military during the Second World War. Those homes were to last for 5 years, 10 years at the most. People are still living in them after 50 years.

In many places, the military cannot live in the houses provided. No. 1, some of them are so bad they cannot live in them with their families, and at other times they just do not exist. So they have to live off base. Because housing is so expensive, they have to go on food stamps. One out of every 10 of our military is on food stamps. Why? Because housing is so outrageously expensive, they have no choice.

What the chairman of the subcommittee did and the ranking member is try to do a little bit to solve that problem—dormitories, barracks where single military can live. We did not go for officer's quarters. We looked to the enlisted men, what we could do to help the enlisted men and women of this country live a little better.

There is a tremendous backlog. We only do a little bit, but that little bit will help those people concerned.

I have to say, Mr. President, if you are in the military and you want to live and live decently, you are really more concerned about that than some new weapons system. If we are going to have a strong military, one of the things we must have are people who feel good about being in the military; they have a decent place to live.

So I strongly endorse the remarks made by the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Montana, my friend, Mr. BURNS. He has done a great job on this subcommittee.

As he has said, each project meets strict criteria. First, these projects are all mission essential.

Second, each of these projects has already been programmed in the Department's outyear budget.

Third, a construction site has been selected for each of these projects, not by members of the subcommittee, not by members of the committee, but by the military.

Fourth, each project is considered by the base commander as their highest priority, not a priority, but their highest priority.

And fifth, each of these projects can be awarded in this 1996 fiscal year.

As I have said on the floor in the past, I do not think anyone would consider the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina, as a big spender. I have never heard the senior Senator from South Carolina referred to as a big spender. I do not know of anyone in the history of the U.S. Senate that has gained a stronger reputation for watching how the money of this country is spent than the Senator from South Carolina, the sponsor of this amendment. And probably running a close

second is the Senator from Georgia, the senior Senator from Georgia, the ranking member, formerly the chairman of this full committee. The senior Senator from Georgia, on all issues, not only military issues, watches where the pennies are spent.

Well, Mr. President, during the floor action to approve the military construction bill, we heard from both co-chairmen of the National Guard Caucus. We heard from Senator BOND of Missouri today and then we heard from Senator FORD of Kentucky. Their statements reflect the degree to which the active services tend to protect their own. The Pentagon always looks out for their own and not very often do they look out for the guard and reserve. That is an obligation traditionally that we have had, and I do not shirk that responsibility. Their statements, I repeat, reflect the degree that the active services tend to protect their own, neglecting adequately to consider and promote the National Guard and Reserve components. The active services can, therefore, budget their forces in the active force request and they traditionally underfund the guard and reserve. This year is no different. That is not the way it should be, but that is the way it is.

The guard and reserve deserve more than what the Pentagon and administration requested in this budget and in budgets in the past. When the going gets tough and there is a potential crisis on the horizon, the guard and reserve are called. I recently received a call from my friend who is a major in the Nevada National Guard. This man left his business during the gulf crisis to serve his country for 1 year. He was a combat veteran from Vietnam. He wanted to go to combat again in Iraq. They would not let him do it. They needed his service in the Pentagon. He has now been asked to go to Germany because he is an expert in something they need. That is what the guard and reserve is all about. They deserve more than what the administration and Pentagon requested in this budget. My friend, Maj. Evan Wallot, is debating in his own mind whether he is going to go to Germany. We in Congress are traditionally forced into the position of putting the priorities into a better balance—I am glad we have done that—which means adding needed funds to projects in the guard and reserve. These funds are for nothing lavish.

The amendment helps emphasize the importance of housing for our military families. This amendment replaces housing that suffers. Some places have suffered more than 50 years of neglect; they were built around the Second World War as temporary structures, built just for that war era.

It was not for the Second World War, not for Korea, not for Vietnam, not the cold war, or for Iraq, not for Haiti. Although that Second World War is long since gone, our military personnel continue to survive in these outdated residences. These projects are not budget

busters. Each Senator should understand that the Military Construction Subcommittee was totally within our 602(b) allocation. Every penny was within the 602(b) allocation. It is just this simple. The committee evaluates rather than the Pentagon.

The budget requested by the Department of Defense has been, once again, as in past years, neglected, and I use that word pointedly to address the military construction needs of the National Guard. It is \$182 million for guard and reserve military construction, as compared to \$574 million appropriated just last year. When approved, this amendment will authorize 20 percent less than last year, some \$452 million.

Once again, I emphasize this amendment addresses the long, overlooked quality of life initiative, particularly, Mr. President, in family housing and barracks, the initiative making up nearly one-third of the total military construction authorization. I repeat, as the senior Senator from Ohio said, military housing is usually short-changed. We recognize that. That is why a third of what we are talking about here goes to military housing.

Mr. President, these programs are wasteful. The chairman of the full committee has sponsored this amendment and has come here to say that these that these projects are important. We must do a better job with the persons defending our country. We must recognize the necessity of the total bill and the effect of this amendment will help to authorize its completion.

Mr. COATS. The Senator from Arizona and I have joined together on a number of items. This is an area where we happen to disagree.

Mr. NUNN. If the Senator will yield, I thank my friend from Nevada for his leadership in this military construction area and for his remarks on the floor, and also my friend from Montana, chairman of that subcommittee. They have done a splendid job, and we have enjoyed working with them.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, some time ago, I contacted the Department of Defense raising my concerns about the status of military housing. As chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee and someone that is charged with looking out for the quality of life of our military personnel, survey after survey, inquiry after inquiry, letter after letter kept raising the issue of the quality, or lack thereof, of military housing, both family housing and single soldier housing. And so I contacted the Department of Defense, and they confirmed my worse suspicions and gave me information that, frankly, was far worse than what I thought I would hear. That is, that military housing is in a deplorable State.

Much of the housing is more than 30 years old. It has suffered from lack of adequate maintenance and repair because funds have been diverted to other uses. Whenever there is a crunch on the

utilization or need for funds, it seems like housing has always been pushed aside to be dealt with next year.

The Secretary of Defense saw that problem in his travels around the world in talking with troops, commanders, and others, and he identified this as a priority and has testified before our committee that this is one of his top priorities. He has articulately drawn the link between quality of life and readiness, and he has displayed for us and outlined for us the very sad state of military housing throughout our military. It has been neglected.

We have young men and women who are committing a career to service for this country, who are given the very best of training; they are given the very best of leadership that this country can offer; they are given the very best of equipment to operate and to utilize that this country can produce. We are attracting some of the very best people that our institutions are graduating to the services today. But when it comes to providing for their living conditions, they are given not the best, not anywhere close to the best, but some of the worst housing you can find in any of our cities across the country.

I have personally visited a number of barracks and a number of family housing units and a number of different bases. These are facilities that do not begin to measure up to minimum standards that we would expect. Some of the statistics are stunning: 60,000 Air Force housing units do not measure up to contemporary standards, and they are probably the best of the services; 75 percent of the Army's family housing does not even meet Department of Defense standards.

I just want to inform my colleagues that Department of Defense standards are not standards that you normally find outside of the military. They are lower; they are smaller in square footage; they require less in terms of quality construction than what is normally found.

I think it is a disgrace that we are putting some of our military people in some of the kind of housing that we find in our military bases.

Nearly 85 percent of the Army's barracks—facilities that house single sailors and soldiers and Air Force and marines—80 to 85 percent of the Army's barracks do not meet current Department of Defense standards. So we have a huge backlog of dilapidated housing in which we are putting our Army families and putting our system military people.

We have leaking roofs, air conditioners that do not work. We have latrine facilities that do not begin to meet the needs of those living in the units. Four shower heads, usually two that are not working, for about 60 to 65 soldiers. We have toilets that do not flush. We have mold that is rotting away the tile and rotting away some of the walls. We have windows that do not provide adequate seals. We have rooms that are of such small square footage



that the military personnel cannot begin to put their stereo, their TV, or just a basic dresser drawer to put their clothes in.

We are looking at a program here that is going to take a number of years, at least a decade, to begin to bring the facilities up to standard.

When we have been able to come up with some additional funds, I think one of the top priorities for those funds needs to be adequate housing for our military personnel.

I cannot speak to the portion of the military construction budget that goes to fund other items. I know we have infrastructure and other maintenance problems throughout the military. I cannot speak to that, but I can speak to the portion that goes to the housing.

I am pleased that the committee has designated this as a priority. I am pleased they have adopted the criteria established by the Senate Armed Services Committee for evaluating these needs. I have had a number of discussions with the chairman of the MilCon Appropriations Subcommittee, and he has outlined for me that they have faithfully followed the criteria and the recommendations to try to get at some of the worst housing on a priority basis.

To the extent that we can accelerate some funding for this crucial area, I think we ought to do that. I am supportive of this particular effort. There is a housing initiative that has been undertaken by the Department. We granted some new authority for that to the Department of Defense.

Passage of this authorization bill and acceptable conference of the item will provide the Department of Defense with needed new authority to privatize some of this construction and maintenance effort, rebuilding efforts, and renovation effort. That is necessary if we are ever going to provide the kind of housing on a decent timetable for our military personnel.

The combination of the military construction funds that are utilized now for building new and renovating military family housing and barracks housing and the initiative that has been undertaken by the Department of Defense with both the inside task force group and an outside task force group headed by former Secretary of the Army John Marsh, a two-pronged effort to try to deal with a very significant problem that exists today in our armed services.

We have directed considerable funds to a number of tactical systems, to modernization, to readiness. If we had more, we could direct more. We wish we had more.

We cannot continue to defer the construction of housing and the renovation of housing for our military personnel and claim that we are providing the necessary quality of life for themselves and their families, that will attract the kind of people we want for our military. We cannot continue to do that. We are forfeiting the future.

We have postponed this now for more than a decade. It is time we undertook this project. I am thankful for the work by the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee. I hope that we can successfully move this forward as we attempt to finalize the legislation on this effort.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I just want to remind the Senate that the House has already passed \$500 million for these facilities. In this amendment we are asking only for \$228 million. The defense appropriations has approved this amount already.

We are ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further discussion? If there is no further discussion, the question is on agreeing to amendment numbered 2084, offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment (No. 2084) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. COATS. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2085

(Purpose: To exclude the Associate Director of Central Intelligence for Military Support from grade limitations applicable to members of the Armed Forces)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], proposes an amendment numbered 2085.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 403, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

#### SEC. 1095. ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE FOR MILITARY SUPPORT.

Section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) In the event that neither the Director nor Deputy Director of Central Intelligence is a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces, a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces appointed to the position of Associate Director of Central Intelligence for Military Support, while serving in such position, shall not be counted against the numbers and percentages of commissioned officers of the rank and grade of such officer authorized for the armed force of which such officer is a member."

Mr. NUNN. This amendment to the National Security Act of 1947 provides, in the event neither the director or deputy director of Central Intelligence is a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces, a commissioned officer of the

telligence for Military Support, while serving in such position, shall not be counted against the numbers and percentages of commissioned officers of the rank and grade of such officers authorized for the Armed Force of which such officer is a member.

Mr. President, the law now provides that a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces appointed as either the Director or Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall not be counted against the numbers and percentages of commissioned officers of the rank and grade of such officer authorized for the Armed Force of which such officer is a member.

At the present time, neither the Director nor Deputy Director of the CIA is a commissioned officer. At the same time, an important new position of Associate Director of the CIA for Military Support is being created. The incumbent of the new position, who will be a three-star admiral, will serve as the principal advisor to the Director and Deputy Director of the CIA on military issues, with particular emphasis on Intelligence Community support for military forces and operations. This will include serving as liaison between the Intelligence Community and senior military officers of the Joint Staff and the unified combatant commands; evaluating the adequacy of intelligence support for all military purposes, including operations, training, and weapons acquisition; reviewing intelligence resources in the light of military needs; representing the Director of Central Intelligence on various boards and interagency groups established for crises and issues that potentially involve the deployment of U.S. military forces; and serving as the Director's principal liaison with foreign military organizations.

This new position will be of critical importance under the circumstances when, as now, neither the Director nor Deputy Director of CIA are commissioned officers. However, because of Congressionally mandated grade limitations, the Navy, which will be providing the 3-star officer for this position, does not have a 3-star number available and has had to borrow a number from the Army. The Army will need that number in a couple of months.

This amendment, by enabling the assignment of a three-star officer without counting against that officer's Armed Force, would facilitate the performance of this critically important function at times when, as at present, neither the Director nor Deputy Director of CIA is a commissioned officer.

What this amendment does, since there is no military officer either as director or deputy director, it simply shifts over and allows this exemption on counting against the officers in the military services to apply to the new position, which is the associate director for military matters.

This is a new position. It will carry out the spirit of what we had done in the past with this exemption.



I believe this amendment is acceptable to both sides. I hope it would be supported.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have no objection to this amendment. It will make it possible for one qualified service military officer to be assigned to the CIA without counting against the limit on senior officers within the Department of Defense.

I join the distinguished Senator from Georgia in supporting this amendment and urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further discussion, the question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 2085, offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment (No. 2085) was agreed to.

Mr. NUNN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. THURMOND. I move to table the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2086

(Purpose: To authorize a land conveyance, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Memphis, TN)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Thompson, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], for Mr. THOMPSON, proposes an amendment numbered 2086.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 487, below line 24, add the following:

**SEC. 2838. LAND CONVEYANCE, NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.**

(a) **AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.**—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to the Memphis and Shelby County Port Commission, Memphis, Tennessee (in this section referred to as the "Port"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property (including any improvements thereon) consisting of approximately 26 acres that is located at the Carderock Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Memphis Detachment, Presidents Island, Memphis, Tennessee.

(b) **CONSIDERATION.**—As consideration for the conveyance of real property under subsection (a), the Port shall—

(1) grant to the United States a restrictive easement in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 100 acres that is adjacent to the Memphis Detachment, Presidents Island, Memphis, Tennessee; and

(2) if the fair market value of the easement granted under paragraph (1) exceeds the fair market value of the real property conveyed under subsection (a), provide the United States such addition consideration as the Secretary and the Port jointly determine appropriate so that the value of the consideration received by the United States under this subsection is equal to or greater than

the fair market value of the real property conveyed under subsection (a).

(c) **CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.**—The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Land Exchange Agreement between the United States of America and the Memphis and Shelby County Port Commission, Memphis, Tennessee.

(d) **DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and of the easement to be granted under subsection (b)(1). Such determinations shall be final.

(e) **USE OF PROCEEDS.**—The Secretary shall deposit any proceeds received under subsection (b)(2) as consideration for the conveyance of real property authorized under subsection (a) in the special account established pursuant to section 204(h) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 485(h)).

(f) **DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and the easement to be granted under subsection (b)(1) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the surveys shall be borne by the Port.

(g) **ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance authorized by subsection (a) and the easement granted under subsection (b)(1) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. THURMOND. The committee has reviewed the amendment. It provides for the exchange of property at fair market value, which ensures that the Federal Government is fully compensated.

The amendment appears to be in the best interest of the Navy and the communities.

I recommend approval of the amendment.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, this amendment is supported by the Department of Navy.

I have a letter dated July 28 from the principal deputy of the Department of Navy, Office of the Assistant Secretary, and I ask it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,  
Washington, DC, July 28, 1995.  
Hon. STROM THURMOND,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: Based on the inquiries from your staff, this is to advise you that the Department of the Navy would support the proposed legislation pertaining to a proposed land agreement involving the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Memphis Detachment and Memphis and Shelby County Port Commission. The property is located at Presidents Island, Memphis, Tennessee.

The proposed legislation will provide a buffer zone between the river and the Cavitation Channel facility, which will increase mission efficiency. In addition, the Navy has no immediate need for the crane which if transferred to the Ports Authority will be maintained in operable condition and available for our use in the future if required.

If I may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

CHERYL KANDARAS,  
Principal Deputy.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, this amendment will allow a transfer of property between the U.S. Navy and the Port of Memphis, TN. The Navy will receive 100 acres of land to act as both a security and acoustic buffer zone for its Naval Service Warfare Center in Memphis. In return, the port will obtain from the Navy a 1,250-ton stiff leg derrick crane. The crane will give the port a facility to load and offload specialty cargo. In fact, no other port in the Central United States will have such lifting capabilities. This will be a great benefit for recruitment of future industry to Memphis and Shelby County.

This is something the Navy wants and the Port of Memphis and others in the community want. Local officials say it will bring new industry and more jobs to the Memphis area. As this is beneficial for both sides and there are no new costs involved, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. NUNN. I urge approval of the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2086) was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. NUNN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 21. An act to terminate the United States arms embargo applicable to the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina.