

|               |               |              |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Livingston    | Pastor        | Smith (MI)   |
| LoBiondo      | Paxon         | Smith (OR)   |
| Lucas         | Pease         | Smith (TX)   |
| Luther        | Peterson (MN) | Smith, Adam  |
| Maloney (CT)  | Peterson (PA) | Smith, Linda |
| Maloney (NY)  | Petri         | Snowbarger   |
| Manton        | Pickering     | Souder       |
| Manzullo      | Pickett       | Spence       |
| Markey        | Pitts         | Spratt       |
| Martinez      | Pombo         | Stabenow     |
| Mascara       | Pomeroy       | Stark        |
| Matsui        | Porter        | Stearns      |
| McCarthy (MO) | Portman       | Stenholm     |
| McCarthy (NY) | Poshard       | Stokes       |
| McCollum      | Price (NC)    | Strickland   |
| McCrery       | Pryce (OH)    | Stump        |
| McDade        | Quinn         | Stupak       |
| McGovern      | Radanovich    | Sununu       |
| McHale        | Ramstad       | Talent       |
| McHugh        | Rangel        | Tanner       |
| McInnis       | Redmond       | Tauzin       |
| McIntosh      | Regula        | Taylor (MS)  |
| McIntyre      | Reyes         | Taylor (NC)  |
| McKeon        | Riley         | Thomas       |
| McNulty       | Rivers        | Thompson     |
| Meehan        | Rodriguez     | Thornberry   |
| Menendez      | Roemer        | Thune        |
| Metcalf       | Rogan         | Thurman      |
| Mica          | Rogers        | Tiahrt       |
| Millender-    | Rohrabacher   | Tierney      |
| McDonald      | Ros-Lehtinen  | Towns        |
| Miller (FL)   | Rothman       | Traficant    |
| Mink          | Roukema       | Turner       |
| Moakley       | Roybal-Allard | Upton        |
| Molinari      | Royce         | Velazquez    |
| Mollohan      | Ryun          | Visclosky    |
| Moran (KS)    | Sabo          | Walsh        |
| Morella       | Salmon        | Wamp         |
| Murtha        | Sanchez       | Watkins      |
| Myrick        | Sanders       | Watt (NC)    |
| Nadler        | Sandlin       | Watts (OK)   |
| Neal          | Sanford       | Waxman       |
| Nethercutt    | Sawyer        | Weldon (FL)  |
| Neumann       | Saxton        | Weldon (PA)  |
| Ney           | Scarborough   | Weller       |
| Northup       | Schaefer, Dan | Wexler       |
| Norwood       | Schaffer, Bob | Weygand      |
| Nussle        | Schumer       | White        |
| Oberstar      | Sensenbrenner | Whitfield    |
| Olver         | Serrano       | Wicker       |
| Ortiz         | Sessions      | Wise         |
| Owens         | Shaw          | Wolf         |
| Oxley         | Shays         | Woolsey      |
| Packard       | Shimkus       | Wynn         |
| Pallone       | Shuster       | Young (AK)   |
| Pappas        | Skeen         | Young (FL)   |
| Parker        | Skelton       |              |
| Pascrell      | Slaughter     |              |

## NAYS—33

|               |             |          |
|---------------|-------------|----------|
| Blumenauer    | LaHood      | Payne    |
| Bonior        | Lewis (GA)  | Pelosi   |
| Campbell      | Lofgren     | Rahall   |
| Conyers       | McDermott   | Scott    |
| Dingell       | McKinney    | Skaggs   |
| Farr          | Meek        | Snyder   |
| Hamilton      | Miller (CA) | Tauscher |
| Harman        | Minge       | Torres   |
| Hastings (FL) | Moran (VA)  | Vento    |
| Hilliard      | Obey        | Waters   |
| LaFalce       | Paul        | Yates    |

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Delahunt

## NOT VOTING—23

|            |            |            |
|------------|------------|------------|
| Becerra    | Gejdenson  | Rush       |
| Bilbray    | Gibbons    | Schiff     |
| Brown (OH) | Gilman     | Shadegg    |
| Coburn     | Hunter     | Sherman    |
| Cox        | Lantos     | Sisisky    |
| Dellums    | LaTourette | Smith (NJ) |
| Edwards    | Lowey      | Solomon    |
| Frost      | Riggs      |            |

## □ 1809

Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, on rollcall No. 236, I inadvertently voted "yes." I intended to vote "no."

Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1997, on rollcall vote 236 on H.R. 1119, the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, I inadvertently voted "yea." It was my intention to vote "no" on the bill.

I have consistently voted against increasing defense spending, especially since the end of the cold war, when our Nation faces its biggest threat, not from outside our shores, but from the impending fiscal disaster that awaits our country.

H.R. 1119 was a \$2.6 billion increase over last year and included items that we either do not need nor can not be justified by objective analysis.

H.R. 1119 included \$331 million for advanced procurement of additional B-2 bombers. The CBO estimates that the additional bombers would cost \$27 billion over the next 20 years. This is for nine planes that neither the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or the Secretary of the Air Force requested nor wants. I voted for an amendment to redirect this money for the use of the National Guard and Reserve, but it failed.

The bill included other questionable weapons systems. It provides \$661 million for the V-22 and \$469 million for the joint strike fighter.

While the House debated the Defense bill, our troops were still in Bosnia without any effective exit date. The House defeated an amendment to set the initial deadline for withdrawal by December 31, 1997. We need to bring our troops home from Bosnia and turn the mission over to our European allies.

H.R. 1119 contained many of the same provisions of past bills that I have voted against.

Mr. Speaker, please let the record reflect that I intended to vote "no" on H.R. 1119.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 246 on today's vote. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 1016), making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 178 and rule

XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2016.

## □ 1813

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for the first time.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] each will control 30 minutes.

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

## □ 1815

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

Let me proceed by informing all the Members that the rules require a record vote on final passage of this bill. Some have inquired.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by saying what a pleasure it has been for me to work with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER]. We have crafted this bill, I think, to be very attractive to all the Members of the Congress.

This is a military construction bill, and our primary concern in this bill was that we address this very serious problem with quality-of-life issues, family housing, barracks, hospitals, day-care centers, and the like. This bill includes \$9,183,000,000. This is within the 602(b) allocations. It represents a \$610 million reduction from last year's appropriated levels. This is a 6 percent reduction. So we want Members of the House to know that this bill is cutting, not raising, the cost of Government.

The Members recognize that this addresses, as I have mentioned, the quality-of-life issues. We recommend that an additional \$800 million above and beyond the request in the President's budget be devoted to improving the troop housing, family housing, child day-care centers. This adds up to \$752 million in barracks, troop housing; \$28 million in child day-care centers; \$146 million in hospital and medical facilities; \$104 million in environmental compliance on our bases; \$1 billion for new housing and improvement of existing housing; and over \$3 billion of the bill is in operation and maintenance of existing inventory. Twenty-three percent of the bill, or \$2.1 billion, is for downsizing DOD's infrastructure, in other words, the base realignment and closure program.

Again, I want to express my deep appreciation to the staff, to the members

of my subcommittee, certainly to the ranking member, for the cooperation we have had in crafting this bipartisan bill. In conclusion, I want to express the fact that we have worked closely with the authorizing committee.

As a matter of fact, all individual items in this bill are included in the

authorization bill. So we worked very closely with the authorizing committee and they have been very, very cooperative. This \$9.2 billion is roughly 4 percent of the total defense budget and \$610 million below last year's level.

We strongly urge the Members of Congress to support the bill and move

it forward. We fully expect that this will move without a great deal of controversy; and, hopefully, we will be able to have our final passage vote within the hour.

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

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2016)

|  | FY 1997<br>Enacted | FY 1998<br>Estimate | Bill            | Bill compared with<br>Enacted | Bill compared with<br>Estimate |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Military construction, Army.....   | 565,688,000        | 595,277,000         | 721,027,000     | + 155,339,000                 | + 125,750,000                  |
| Rescissions .....  | -3,028,000         |                     |                 | + 3,028,000                   |                                |
| Total, Military construction, Army (net).....                                  | 562,660,000        | 595,277,000         | 721,027,000     | + 158,367,000                 | + 125,750,000                  |
| Military construction, Navy.....   | 707,094,000        | 540,106,000         | 685,306,000     | -21,788,000                   | + 145,200,000                  |
| Rescissions .....  | -19,780,000        |                     |                 | + 19,780,000                  |                                |
| Total, Military construction, Navy (net) .....                                 | 687,314,000        | 540,106,000         | 685,306,000     | -2,008,000                    | + 145,200,000                  |
| Military construction, Air Force .....   | 754,064,000        | 495,782,000         | 662,305,000     | -91,759,000                   | + 166,523,000                  |
| Rescissions .....  | -5,100,000         |                     |                 | + 5,100,000                   |                                |
| Total, Military construction, Air Force (net).....                             | 748,964,000        | 495,782,000         | 662,305,000     | -86,659,000                   | + 166,523,000                  |
| Military construction, Defense-wide.....                                       | 763,922,000        | 673,633,000         | 613,333,000     | -150,589,000                  | -60,300,000                    |
| Rescissions .....  | -51,000,000        |                     |                 | + 51,000,000                  |                                |
| Total, Military construction, Defense-wide (net) .....                         | 712,922,000        | 673,633,000         | 613,333,000     | -99,589,000                   | -60,300,000                    |
| Total, Active components .....   | 2,711,860,000      | 2,304,798,000       | 2,681,971,000   | -29,889,000                   | + 377,173,000                  |
| Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing<br>Improvement Fund ..... | 5,000,000          |                     |                 | -5,000,000                    |                                |
| Military construction, Army National Guard .....                               | 78,086,000         | 45,098,000          | 45,098,000      | -32,988,000                   |                                |
| Military construction, Air National Guard.....                                 | 189,855,000        | 60,225,000          | 137,275,000     | -52,580,000                   | + 77,050,000                   |
| Rescission.....  | -5,000,000         |                     |                 | + 5,000,000                   |                                |
| Total, Military construction, Air National Guard<br>(net) .....                | 184,855,000        | 60,225,000          | 137,275,000     | -47,580,000                   | + 77,050,000                   |
| Military construction, Army Reserve .....                                      | 55,543,000         | 39,112,000          | 77,731,000      | + 22,188,000                  | + 38,619,000                   |
| Military construction, Naval Reserve.....                                      | 37,579,000         | 13,921,000          | 40,561,000      | + 2,982,000                   | + 26,640,000                   |
| Military construction, Air Force Reserve .....                                 | 52,805,000         | 14,530,000          | 27,143,000      | -25,662,000                   | + 12,613,000                   |
| Total, Reserve components .....  | 408,868,000        | 172,886,000         | 327,808,000     | -81,060,000                   | + 154,922,000                  |
| Total, Military construction.....  | 3,125,728,000      | 2,477,684,000       | 3,009,779,000   | -115,949,000                  | + 532,095,000                  |
| Appropriations .....   | (3,209,636,000)    | (2,477,684,000)     | (3,009,779,000) | (-199,857,000)                | (+ 532,095,000)                |
| Rescissions .....  | (-83,908,000)      |                     |                 | (+ 83,908,000)                |                                |
| NATO Security Investment Program .....   | 172,000,000        | 176,300,000         | 166,300,000     | -5,700,000                    | -10,000,000                    |
| Family housing, Army:  |                    |                     |                 |                               |                                |
| Construction .....   | 158,503,000        | 143,000,000         | 202,131,000     | + 43,628,000                  | + 59,131,000                   |
| Operation and Maintenance.....   | 1,212,466,000      | 1,148,937,000       | 1,148,937,000   | -63,529,000                   |                                |
| Total, Family housing, Army.....   | 1,370,969,000      | 1,291,937,000       | 1,351,068,000   | -19,901,000                   | + 59,131,000                   |
| Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:   |                    |                     |                 |                               |                                |
| Construction .....   | 499,886,000        | 278,933,000         | 409,178,000     | -90,708,000                   | + 130,245,000                  |
| Operation and Maintenance.....   | 1,020,721,000      | 976,504,000         | 976,504,000     | -44,217,000                   |                                |
| Total, Family housing, Navy .....  | 1,520,607,000      | 1,255,437,000       | 1,385,682,000   | -134,925,000                  | + 130,245,000                  |
| Family housing, Air Force:   |                    |                     |                 |                               |                                |
| Construction .....   | 317,507,000        | 253,128,000         | 341,409,000     | + 23,902,000                  | + 88,281,000                   |
| Operation and Maintenance.....   | 816,509,000        | 830,234,000         | 830,234,000     | + 13,725,000                  |                                |
| Total, Family housing, Air Force.....  | 1,134,016,000      | 1,083,362,000       | 1,171,643,000   | + 37,627,000                  | + 88,281,000                   |
| Family housing, Defense-wide:  |                    |                     |                 |                               |                                |
| Construction .....   | 4,371,000          | 4,950,000           | 4,950,000       | + 579,000                     |                                |
| Operation and Maintenance.....   | 30,963,000         | 32,724,000          | 32,724,000      | + 1,761,000                   |                                |
| Total, Family housing, Defense-wide .....                                      | 35,334,000         | 37,674,000          | 37,674,000      | + 2,340,000                   |                                |
| Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund .....                    | 25,000,000         |                     |                 | -25,000,000                   |                                |
| Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense.....                                       | 36,181,000         |                     |                 | -36,181,000                   |                                |
| Total, Family housing .....  | 4,122,107,000      | 3,868,410,000       | 3,946,067,000   | -176,040,000                  | + 277,657,000                  |
| Construction .....   | (980,267,000)      | (680,011,000)       | (957,668,000)   | (-22,599,000)                 | (+ 277,657,000)                |
| Operation and Maintenance.....   | (3,080,659,000)    | (2,988,399,000)     | (2,988,399,000) | (-92,260,000)                 |                                |
| Family Housing Improvement Fund.....   | (25,000,000)       |                     |                 | (-25,000,000)                 |                                |
| Homeowners Assistance Fund .....   | (36,181,000)       |                     |                 | (-36,181,000)                 |                                |

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2016)—Continued**

|  | FY 1997<br>Enacted | FY 1998<br>Estimate | Bill            | Bill compared with<br>Enacted | Bill compared with<br>Estimate |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Base realignment and closure accounts:</b>          |                    |                     |                 |                               |                                |
| Part II .....  | 352,800,000        | 116,754,000         | 116,754,000     | -236,046,000                  | .....                          |
| Rescissions .....                                      | -35,391,000        | .....               | .....           | + 35,391,000                  | .....                          |
| Subtotal .....   | 317,409,000        | 116,754,000         | 116,754,000     | -200,655,000                  | .....                          |
| Part III .....   | 971,925,000        | 768,702,000         | 768,702,000     | -203,223,000                  | .....                          |
| Rescissions .....                                      | -75,638,000        | .....               | .....           | + 75,638,000                  | .....                          |
| Subtotal .....   | 896,287,000        | 768,702,000         | 768,702,000     | -127,585,000                  | .....                          |
| Part IV .....  | 1,182,749,000      | 1,175,398,000       | 1,175,398,000   | -7,351,000                    | .....                          |
| Rescissions .....                                      | -22,971,000        | .....               | .....           | + 22,971,000                  | .....                          |
| Subtotal .....   | 1,159,778,000      | 1,175,398,000       | 1,175,398,000   | + 15,620,000                  | .....                          |
| Total, Base realignment & closure accounts (net) ..... | 2,373,474,000      | 2,060,854,000       | 2,060,854,000   | -312,620,000                  | .....                          |
| <b>Grand total:</b>                                    |                    |                     |                 |                               |                                |
| New budget (obligational) authority .....              | 9,793,309,000      | 8,383,248,000       | 9,183,000,000   | -610,309,000                  | + 799,752,000                  |
| Appropriations .....                                   | (10,011,217,000)   | (8,383,248,000)     | (9,183,000,000) | (-828,217,000)                | (+ 799,752,000)                |
| Rescissions .....                                      | (-217,908,000)     | .....               | .....           | (+ 217,908,000)               | .....                          |

Mr. PACKARD.

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

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the chairman of the committee, who is one of the finest gentlemen I have ever worked with in this House, and this is one of the best committees, I guess, in the entire House of Representatives. And I would like to congratulate the staff, because they have done a tremendous job, both on the minority side and the majority side, they have done a tremendous job in putting together this bill, and it merits the support of everyone in this House.

This bill contains, as the chairman has said, some \$9.2 billion in total funding. This is \$600 million below last year. I would like to remind some of the critics of the bill that we have been taken to task that we are over the President's mark. But I would like to remind the Members of the House that we have a committee that in the past 2 years, under both Democrat and Republican administrations, we have had to fight very hard to get money for quality of life for our troops. We have concentrated on doing the best that we can for quality of life for our troops, and we think we have done a good job with limited funds.

We have got 50 new barracks projects, and all of our barracks are over 40 years old. We need another 250,000 units. And I might add that everything in this package has been authorized and was voted on and passed in this House. So I think we have a very good bill, and I want to thank the chairman for all of his courtesy to work with us through the years and for the staff.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill, and I want the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] to know that it is a joy to serve on his subcommittee and under his chairmanship.

As I said at the markup, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] could give us all lessons in how to mark up a bill in an efficient way and to get the job done. The gentleman from California has done an outstanding job in crafting this bill that addresses the quality of life and needs of our armed services.

The men and women who serve this country deserve the very best that we can provide, and this bill includes increased funding for billets, for new family housing units, and for private family homes. Each of these are essential to the readiness of our Armed Forces.

I am particularly pleased that the chairman funded several projects at the Great Lakes Naval Base in my district. The Great Lakes Naval Training Center serves as the Navy's only primary training base and the principle location for early training skills. This bill includes new enlisted barracks at the Great Lakes Naval Hospital at a cost of \$5.2 million in new barracks, two new fire stations, and a combat pool at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center at a cost of \$26.7 million.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], this bill takes very strong steps in improving the quality of life for our armed services. He has done a masterful job in crafting the bill, and I applaud him and urge support of all Members.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER], who is a member of the committee.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, I rise to support this bill, but particularly to commend the gentleman from California, Mr. PACKARD, for his very effective leadership, and then also to commend both Chairman Packard and the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. HEFNER, the ranking member, for their very bipartisan working relationship which was indeed, as the previous speaker said, a joy to work with.

The fiscal 1998 MILCON appropriations bill continues to focus on the quality of life for servicemen and women. Improving quality of life for those who serve in the Armed Forces and for their families is critical if we are going to retain our best personnel beyond their minimum service requirements. We are spending billions on new weapons, and we ought to spend enough to ensure that the servicemen and women who operate those sophisticated weapons are not left in substandard and in some cases deplorable living conditions.

To that end, this bill provides funding, in some cases above the Pentagon's request, for new child development centers; new hospital and medical facilities, including treatment centers and medical research facilities; and for cleanup at military bases where contamination sites that are in violation of either Federal or State environmental protection laws do exist.

The report which accompanies this bill contains initiatives that should be supported by all Members. These initiatives are aimed at saving costs and bringing common sense to construction planning by the service branches.

There are instructions in the report for each military department to develop a unified design guidance program to stop wasteful, duplicative spending on the engineering and design of like projects, including duplicative

spending on computer programs used in the engineering, design, and construction of standard military facilities.

A second cost-saving measure in the subcommittee's report is the forwarding of Bold Venture, the Pentagon's program to move military entrance processing stations from private, commercial buildings to military installations in order to reduce office rent expenditures and the cost associated with housing recruits in hotels rather than in barracks.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for including this language in the subcommittee's report, and I look forward to reviewing the Defense Logistics Agency's report on the budgeting timetable for Bold Venture, which is due to the Appropriations Committee no later than January 1998.

But perhaps the best feature of this package is the specific instruction included by the chairman to the Army, the Army National Guard, and the National Guard Bureau on the need for a concerted system of planning and prioritizing the hundreds and hundreds of unbudgeted Army National Guard construction projects.

The subcommittee report before the House today points out that the Army Guard has no comprehensive approach whatsoever to armory construction—as well as no understandable, consistent method for prioritizing competing armory and readiness center construction projects.

I commend the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the chairman, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] in taking steps to improve this extremely poor budgeting process, both for the next fiscal year and for the long run.

For those reasons and more, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the fiscal 1998 military construction bill.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly echo the sentiments of other speakers who already talked tonight in commendation of our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member, for the bipartisan nature in which they have approached this issue, taking care of quality-of-life and readiness issues, all within our budget allocation.

Mr. Chairman, I think it might surprise many American people to hear that over 25 percent of our military barracks are in substandard condition at the present time and over 66 percent of onbase housing is considered substandard. And that is what this bill is principally about.

I was glad to see my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], talk

about quality of life as it affects readiness. It would take 32 years and \$30 billion in order to correct all of the problems presently associated with our military housing.

Forty-two percent of this bill goes toward family housing needs, \$1 billion toward new family housing, and another \$3 billion toward operation and maintenance of existing facilities. There are also many other needs that are met by the bill: \$28 million for child development centers, \$146 million for hospital and medical facilities, \$752 million for barracks facilities.

So I just want to echo the comments of other speakers already and congratulate the chairman and the ranking member. Because of the rule, we will have a recorded vote; and I certainly would expect an overwhelming vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the chairman of the authorizing Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2016, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] have described the principal features of this legislation, and I do not want to repeat what they already have said. But as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I would like to elaborate on a couple of points that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] have made.

This House has been concerned for some time about the serious shortfalls in basic infrastructure, military housing, and other facilities that affect the readiness of our Armed Forces and the quality of life for military personnel and their families, and Congress has taken action to attempt to address those shortfalls.

Both the authorization and appropriations committees of jurisdiction were disappointed that the budget requested by the administration for fiscal year 1998 continued a pattern of significant deterioration in the funding programmed by the Department of Defense for military construction, in spite of the very clear and obvious facilities problem that the services confront. This legislation will not solve all those problems, but, if it passes, it will be a further demonstration of the commitment of the House to correct the severe deficiencies that exist at our military installations.

I am gratified that the authorization and appropriations subcommittees have continued their close working relationship. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] is correct that all projects recommended for appropriation in the bill have been represented for authorization in H.R. 1119, the Na-

tional Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998, which passed the House prior to the recess by a vote of 304 to 120.

□ 1830

This House has always responded to the clear and compelling need of the military services. H.R. 2016 reflects a bipartisan consensus on military construction that has already been ratified by the House. I urge Members to keep faith with the men and women in uniform and continue our effort to improve their living and working conditions. I ask for my colleagues' support for this bill.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me take just a moment to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and compliment him as the subcommittee chairman on the authorizing committee, to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the chairman, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member who has labored so long and so well in his previous chairmanship on this. This is an excellent bill, and I think it should pass, as the gentleman says, overwhelmingly. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] for a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, what I am trying to accomplish in lieu of an amendment that I intended to offer in this colloquy with the chairman is based on an issue that arises from my district where the Military Ocean Terminal in Bayonne, NJ is going to close. That is a foregone conclusion. We understand that. But as part of this process, the BRAC Commissioners voted to take the Military Sealift Command that was there and have them relocate to a base X, an undisclosed base. My understanding is that there would be a financial feasibility as to what would be the most appropriate place to have the Military Sealift Command be relocated to.

The Navy has gone off unreined to determine that they want to go to a location that does not in fact substantiate itself with any study as to what is the financial cost and whether it is the most financially feasible cost. Consequently we have learned that they intend to go to Camp Pendleton, VA.

In January of this year, I asked for a GAO report simply to find out whether or not they have done a study and if not what is the most appropriate place in terms of the consequences of the financial impact of moving this and is this the most financially feasible both for the Navy and for the U.S. tax-

payers. We are expecting the design phase of that, to have it within the next 2 weeks, but it will take a little more time to have a final report.

What I am trying to accomplish, Mr. Chairman, in this colloquy is, first of all, I understand that there is no money in this bill for such a transfer of the Military Sealift Command. Am I correct in that statement?

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Second, Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the gentleman will work with us to seek a resolution with the Navy on this matter in order to ensure that the taxpayers' money is well spent and we are going to the most appropriate place.

Mr. PACKARD. Of course we will work with the gentleman in every way we can to resolve the problem.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises to express his concerns regarding the lack of funding for many Army National Guard projects in H.R. 2016. This deficiency, I am told, in funding is apparently the result of a lack of communications by the Army National Guard Bureau with the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee as to the priorities of the various projects requested by each State's Army National Guard. Reference to that matter was previously made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts. There is certainly a lesson to be learned by the Army National Guard Bureau from this process. I believe the Army National Guard Bureau must learn that it can no longer rely on the political connections of the past with respect to both the Congress and the Pentagon. It must also make more energetic efforts to directly communicate its needs and its priorities to the Appropriations Subcommittee.

This member recognizes the great difficulty the members of the subcommittee faced in formulating this appropriation bill. It is clear that extremely tight budgetary constraints made the job of the subcommittee much more difficult, especially when coupled with this lack of adequate communications by the Army National Guard Bureau.

It is my understanding that this unfortunate situation has resulted in the lack of appropriations for many worthy projects for the Army National Guard, including projects in the districts of the subcommittee members. I strongly regret that circumstance. This member, for example, requested the subcommittee's consideration of two military construction projects for the Nebraska National Guard. They should

have received strong consideration and bureau support, and I will expect that this deficiency will be corrected in the short-range future.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this member would like to express his hope that this unfortunate situation is rectified by the Army National Guard Bureau and that a similar predicament is not encountered in the future by members of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

This criticism of the bureau has to be made, it seems to me, but it is offered by this member for constructive reasons. Therefore, I would hope that the bureau does not have any future sense of retribution for bringing this deficiency to the attention of the body.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member and all the members of the subcommittee for the outstanding job they have done on the bill they bring before us.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a member of the full committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I appreciate my colleague from California for the good work that he and the ranking member have executed on the bill. But I come to the committee with a concern. For the first time I visited West Point this year, just a couple of weeks ago. We have a facility built in the 1920's, and they put through 4,000 cadets a day in these facilities. My colleagues say, "What does a Navy guy want to help the Army for?" Because we train our men and women to go to war and they are hurting bad. The facilities are cracked, they are falling down in some cases, and this is what we have to offer the best of the best that go through? These rascals even had "Beat Navy" signs on their houses, on their bleachers, on their cars, and in their dormitories, but that does not overshadow the fact that I would like to appeal to the gentleman from California next year to go forward and take a trip there and he will see just how decimated West Point is in relation to our other academies.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes in response to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. For many, many years I have been on this Subcommittee on Military Construction. It has been our number one initiative to try to do what we can for quality of life and to help for retention for what we believe is the finest young men and women in the world in our Armed Forces. We have tried very, very hard to put the focus on quality of life, both in the authorizing committee and in the appropriations committee. But I must say, it has been very difficult over the years in both Democrat and Republican administrations, it always makes the request short of what is needed for quality of life for our military people. We have had some criticism in this particular

bill that we are pork-barreling. But I do not think it is pork-barreling when we are doing the very best that we can with limited dollars for our men and women in the Armed Forces. The people who are so critical of us do not realize that we have had pauses, one year we did not have any money particular at all, we did no improvements in barracks and quality of life, and then we have had the only budget in this House that has been stagnant at best. We have actually lost ground over the last few budget sessions. We have done a good job, and the chairman has done a good job in putting together along with the staff what I consider a very, very good budget. I agree with my friend from California, it is absolutely terrible when we go to these bases, in some of them these young men and women are operating the most sophisticated weapons that man has ever devised and they are walking across unpaved parking lots and standing in showers up to their ankles to get a bath. This is absolutely not right. This should be a higher priority. This should be a real priority for any administration to do whatever is needed for quality of life for our men and women who lay it on the line, who make the sacrifice for their families. They certainly do not make a lot of money. If we are going to have a volunteer force, if we are going to count on retention and these young men signing up to stay and to serve their country, we are going to have to put more focus on quality of life for our troops. That is what we have tried to do in this bill. I think it is a bill that certainly, certainly merits the support of all the Members of this House.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond and certainly agree totally and wholeheartedly with the ranking member that just spoke. Certainly we need to retain the trained men and women that we have. We spend billions of dollars to train our men and women only to lose them because we do not have adequate housing, we do not have adequate facilities for them. That is atrocious. I also agree with the gentleman from California in regard to the need to improve our academies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for yielding me this time.

I certainly want to express my support for this military construction funding bill and certainly want to commend not only the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] but the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for their good work on this bill. I know the Subcommittee on Military Construction had less money to work with this year and they have done an admirable job of crafting a bill which

increases the quality of life for American military personnel and makes important investments in our defense facilities.

As I heard the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] comment about what is good and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] talk about what is good for our young men and women in the service, I want to give an example of this committee's work that relates to the Air Force Base and the Air National Guard unit at Fairchild Air Force Base in my district in Spokane, WA. Fairchild Air Force Base began in 1942 as an airplane maintenance depot, and then it became a B-29 bomber base after World War II. In 1976, it became the 141st Air Refueling Wing, it moved to Fairchild as a tenant unit, and it houses the KC-135s for the Air National Guard in hangars which were meant for World War II.

These hangars are large enough to cover most of the airplane, but not the tail and the fuselage. So for 20 years the rear end of these airplanes has stuck out in the open air. Whenever an Air National Guard mechanic had to go out and work on this airplane, he had to stand out in the cold, and it gets very cold in my part of the country in the wintertime.

I just want these two distinguished gentlemen to understand, and the rest of my colleagues to understand, too, that this has a very practical implication in my district because it is correcting a problem that has existed for years, and it really is a readiness issue and it is a service issue for these young men and women who work on these airplanes. So by modifying this Air National Guard hangar in my district, the whole plane is going to be under cover during the winter months and they are going to have maintenance be able to occur. That is just one example of some very important measures in this bill that improve the quality of life of our American men and women in uniform.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend support for this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2016, the Military Construction Appropriations Act. This bill aptly balances budgetary concerns with military concerns. In the process, quality of life issues are considered and addressed by this bill. I commend Chairman PACKARD and Congressman HEFNER for their efforts on this bill. They have done a superb job. This bill is the appropriations for military construction projects. But, I think it is important to understand that this bill is really appropriations for the infrastructure that supports our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. This Bill also supports quality of life issues that are important to our men and women in service.

Like many Members with their own districts, I have remained aware of military construction projects for bases in my district. I am encouraged by the planned projects and recognize that these were planned by DOD and contributed to the military environment on Guam positively. The projects followed the normal budgetary cycle and now are close to final approval. However, DOD has also attempted to

request funding outside the normal budgetary process. This funding would be for construction of a DOD Dependent School on Guam. To characterize this properly, DOD first took actions in November 1996 regarding an education contract between DOD and the Government of Guam. They stopped payment. This clearly indicates DOD had the time to include appropriations requests for school construction during the normal budget cycle. In February of this year, DOD Comptroller Secretary Hamre testified before the Subcommittee on Military Construction that there were no current plans to establish DOD schools on Guam. However, there have been indications that DOD is seeking a congressional add for the project. This sends the wrong message. Local elected leaders in Guam have worked hard to open discussions with DOD regarding education issues, but have had little cooperation. Now DOD wants to change its own self proscribed timeline and establish DOD schools this year vice next year. I say let's keep the school year 1998 timeline. This will allow time for local education officials and DOD to discuss issues and will preserve the appropriations process.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as having been read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2016

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the

purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$721,027,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$71,577,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$685,306,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$46,659,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$662,305,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$45,880,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

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

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$613,333,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$34,350,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military con-

struction authorization Acts, \$45,098,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$137,275,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$77,731,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$40,561,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$27,143,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

#### NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

##### SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in military construction authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, \$166,300,000, to remain available until expended.

#### FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$202,131,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,148,937,000; in all \$1,351,068,000.

#### FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$409,178,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$976,504,000; in all \$1,385,682,000.

#### FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and

maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$341,409,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$830,234,000; in all \$1,171,643,000.

#### FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$4,950,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002; for Operation and Maintenance, \$32,724,000; in all \$37,674,000.

#### BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART II

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$116,754,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$105,224,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

#### BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART III

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$768,702,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$398,499,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

#### BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART IV

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$1,175,398,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$353,604,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply in the case of contracts for environmental restoration at an installation that is being closed or realigned where payments are made from a Base Realignment and Closure Account.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be

available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

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

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

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

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

#### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects, and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

#### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. During the five-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense" to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Gulf to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

#### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. During the current fiscal year, in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by

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

SEC. 121. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

SEC. 122. (a) In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

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

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations made available to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund shall be the sole source of funds available for planning, administrative, and oversight costs incurred by the Department of Defense relating to military family housing initiatives and military unaccompanied housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, and supporting facilities.

□ 1845

Mr. PACKARD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 17, line 21, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM:

Page 17, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 125. None of the funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used for military construction for the Naval Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment tonight out of a great deal of frustration because of what has gone on over the past several years regarding a small portion of the Navy's training center in Orlando, FL that was ordered closed in a base closure decision in 1995. That small portion is the Navy's Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center. That center was directed in 1995 to be relocated to New London, CT to go along with the Navy's submarine and other nuclear facilities there. But in the process of the 1995 closure commission decision, a decision was made to keep open the submarine base in New London, CT, and as a result of that there was no place for the nuclear power school facilities that are now in Orlando to go there. The cost to go to New London, to build new buildings, to buy new land, to dig under the granite there was too great, and the Navy came back—and I said 1995, it was 1993—came back in 1995 and requested a redirect from New London to Charleston of this particular facility. And in 1995 I argued rather vehemently before that commission that the school should be kept in Orlando, not moved to Charleston; that it was not a cost-effective move and that the payback period, which is the way we measure these sorts of things, was going to be way too long.

But the rules of the game that the Base Closure Commission used at that time said, hey, we are going to look at this as though the nuclear power facilities have already been moved to New London, and then we are going to compare a move from New London to Charleston to a move from New London to Orlando; and the reality was it was a lot cheaper to move to Charleston from New London. But that was a total fiction. The reality is that the Navy's Nuclear Propulsion Training Center schools and so forth are still in Orlando this day.

So last year along the way with appropriated moneys that were put forward subsequent to that base closure realignment decision, they began to construct in Charleston earlier than anticipated on these new schools, and I asked the General Accounting Office for a report. The General Accounting Office came back. They have done, as far as I know, no other reports on base closure work. They have got some comprehensive work undergoing. But they were willing to do this on this one occasion because it did not seem right to them either; and in November of 1996, last year, they issued a report on this matter in which they described the fact that in reality, having looked at this matter, I was right all along; that the payback period was going to be 20

years in order to pay back the cost of the upfront maneuvering to make this move to Charleston. And the net bottom line is that 20 years is far in excess of any payback period for any base closure that I am aware of in 1991, 1993, or 1995.

Mr. Chairman, at any rate I am left with no recourse but to comment on this today and to seek redress to pull that funding back. We are otherwise going to waste a whole lot of money. It is \$151 million to make this move to Charleston, unnecessarily being spent by the Navy right now. I am told that if we stop this process today, we could still save \$80 or \$90 million of that amount of money. There is no reason to have this new school being built there. There is no reason that it could not stay in Orlando in a containment facility, which was an alternative that was proposed and is considered, and in fact it is the logical thing to do in light of this General Accounting Office report which, as I say, corroborates what I am saying.

The Navy's excuse for not doing this, and I have talked to the Secretary of the Navy, is that we do have long-term recurring savings by making the move, and of course we do. Every base closure proposal has long-term recurring savings. The point is, though, that it takes more than 20 years in this move to pay back the upfront costs by those recurring savings, and anything greater than 8, 9, 10, 11 years is unheard of in base closures as far as payback period times are concerned.

Twenty years is way out of line, totally wrong. Unfortunately when the base closure laws were passed, there were no remedies for errors like this built into law. Once we got through the process, once an error is made, that seems to be finality. The authorizing committee did not have an open rule out here for me to bring this up to my colleagues under, and consequently I am here today having asked the Secretary of Defense to stop the money flowing, asked the Secretary of Navy to no avail, on more than one occasion, written letters, banged on the door of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] in the authorizing subcommittee, and find myself totally frustrated by the absence of an equitable and fair process to resolve this matter in the best interests of the taxpayers.

And while somebody can say, "Well, you are arguing for your own district here," actually we got a great base reuse plan undergoing, and the Navy just yesterday concluded negotiations with the city of Orlando that I think will wind up being approved, so the issue is not that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCOLLUM was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. The issue is not a question of what is best for Orlando. The issue is what is wrong with a base

move that should never have taken place, what is wrong with the fact that our laws do not provide a remedy for an error like this, and once one reads this General Accounting Office report that I will put in the RECORD at the appropriate time in the House of the Whole, it seems to me that the only reasonable remedy is for us to proceed with pulling back the money that was appropriated previously.

And so I would urge my chairman, though his point of order may be technically correct, to allow this amendment to proceed. It is the only remedy I know to stop this loss, unnecessary loss of money, and to remedy a base closure problem that really otherwise has no remedy that I know of that we can address.

The Navy's nuclear power facilities should remain in Orlando; the savings of money should be there. The move to Charleston makes absolutely no sense. A 20-year payback period is absurdly wrong, and the General Accounting Office report confirms the fact that we are wasting the taxpayers' money to make this move to some extraordinary measure that may be indicative of other problems, but I am only here to address the one tonight.

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

U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE,  
NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTER-  
NATIONAL AFFAIRS DIVISION,  
Washington, DC, November 22, 1996.

Hon. BILL MCCOLLUM,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCCOLLUM: In response to your June 18, 1996, request, we compared the overall cost of moving the Navy's Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center (NNPTC) to Charleston, South Carolina, with the cost of retaining the Center in Orlando, Florida. On September 25, 1996, we briefed you on the results of our work; this letter summarizes that briefing.

#### BACKGROUND

In 1993 the Department of Defense (DOD) recommended to the 1993 Base Closure and Realignment Commission that the Navy's Training Center in Orlando, Florida, which housed the NNPTC, be closed. Most of the Center's basic and advanced training activities would then be relocated to the Navy's Great Lakes Training Center in Illinois. DOD recommended that the NNPTC be relocated to the submarine base at New London, Connecticut, and that the submarines at New London be relocated to Kings Bay, Georgia. The Commission approved the recommendation on the Navy Training Center but did not approve the submarine relocation. As a result, costly new construction was required for the NNPTC at New London.

During development of its 1995 base closure recommendations, the Navy looked for a less costly location for the NNPTC and ultimately recommended the Naval Weapons Station in Charleston, South Carolina. The 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission approved the relocation. To date, the NNPTC has not been relocated. Retaining NNPTC at the Navy Training Center in Orlando was not considered because it had been approved for closure in the previous Base Closure and Realignment round.

#### RESULTS IN BRIEF

Our analysis of Navy cost data shows that moving the NNPTC to Charleston will re-

quire more in up-front investment costs than remaining in Orlando. This cost will take about 20 years to recover through reduced annual operating expenses. Keeping the NNPTC in Orlando would not require such a large up-front cost, but operating the Center would cost more per year in Orlando than in Charleston.

#### ESTIMATED COSTS OF RELOCATION AND OPERATION

Our analysis of Navy cost data shows that moving the NNPTC to Charleston would require \$115.4 million more in up-front costs than keeping the Center in Orlando. It also shows that the annual operating cost at Charleston would be about \$8.8 million less than at Orlando. Table 1 shows the estimated one-time and annual recurring costs of relocating the NNPTC to Charleston and the costs of keeping it in Orlando.

TABLE 1: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ESTIMATED COSTS OF RELOCATING THE NNPTC TO CHARLESTON AND LEAVING IT IN ORLANDO

| [Dollars in millions]                        |            |         |                         |
|--|------------|---------|-------------------------|
| Cost category                                | Charleston | Orlando | Difference <sup>a</sup> |
| One-time:                                    |            |         |                         |
| Construction and/or renovation .....         | \$125.6    | \$25.7  | \$99.9                  |
| Contract cancellation .....                  |            | 10.0    | (10.0)                  |
| Relocation <sup>b</sup> .....                | 25.5       |         | 25.5                    |
| Total .....                                  | 151.1      | 35.7    | 115.4                   |
| Annual recurring:                            |            |         |                         |
| Support .....                                | 15.7       | 20.3    | (4.6)                   |
| Housing .....                                | 4.0        | 6.3     | (2.3)                   |
| PCS <sup>c</sup> to follow on training ..... |            | 1.9     | (1.9)                   |
| Total .....                                  | 19.7       | 28.5    | (8.8)                   |

<sup>a</sup>This column shows the difference between the costs in Charleston and Orlando (numbers in brackets are savings).

<sup>b</sup>Costs of relocating personnel and equipment and separating civilian personnel.

<sup>c</sup>Permanent change of station.

We based the cost estimates in table 1 on Navy data. These estimates came largely from current budget data or data developed during the 1995 base closure and realignment process. The budget data has not yet been finalized and is subject to change. The data developed during the 1995 base closure and realignment process was certified by the Navy as complete and accurate when it was submitted. We believe that this data is the best available for estimating the relative cost differences between the two locations. Following is a brief explanation of each of the cost categories in table 1.

**One-Time Costs.** The major one-time cost of relocating the NNPTC to Charleston is for the construction of classrooms, bachelor enlisted quarters (BEQ), a galley, and an addition to the existing medical/dental clinic. A contract for construction of all these facilities except for the clinic was signed on August 13, 1996. We took the one-time costs from contract data and the Chief, Naval Education and Training (CNET), fiscal year 1998 budget submission to Navy headquarters. Relocation costs are those generally associated with any base closure. We took the relocation cost estimate from the fiscal year 1998 CNET budget submission.

The one-time costs for Orlando reflect actions that may have to be taken if the NNPTC remains in Orlando, that is, construction and renovation of existing BEQs to meet current DOD enlisted housing standards and cancellation of the Charleston construction contract. The estimated cost to construct and renovate Orlando BEQs came from Navy data developed during the 1995 base closure and realignment process. However, when the Navy will actually budget the \$25.7 million to construct and renovate the Orlando BEQs is uncertain. We included the Charleston construction contract cancellation cost in one-time costs because the con-

struction contract was awarded on August 13, 1996. Navy officials from the Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, estimated that if the Navy cancelled the contract by December 31, 1996, the termination cost would be about \$10 million.

**Annual Recurring Costs.** The estimated \$15.7 million annual Charleston support cost is taken from the fiscal year 1998 CNET budget submission. The budget submission contains an estimate of the cost to support the training center once it relocates to Charleston. According to Navy officials, the budget review process is not complete, and the estimates are therefore subject to change. The estimate does not include housing costs for training center staff and married students. According to Charleston officials, on-base family housing will be available for all those that need it. Charleston officials estimated the cost of operating this housing to be \$4 million annually.

We took the estimated Orlando annual support cost of \$20.3 million from data the Navy developed at the request of the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission. This estimate also does not include housing costs for training center staff and married students. According to Navy officials, no on-base housing would be available at Orlando, so housing would have to be obtained on the local economy. Navy data developed during the 1995 base closure and realignment process showed that the annual basic allowance for quarters and variable housing allowance cost at Orlando would be \$6.3 million. Additionally, about half the students graduating from the Orlando training center would attend follow-on training at Charleston and incur permanent change of station costs. Again using Navy data, we estimated this cost to be \$1.9 million.

#### PAYBACK PERIOD

Payback is the time in years before money spent on an action is recovered. Given the \$115.4 million difference in the one-time cost of moving to Charleston versus the cost of remaining in Orlando, and the annual operating cost reduction of \$8.8 million, it would take about 20 years to payback the difference in one-time costs. The Navy maintained that it would have to upgrade the BEQ at Orlando if they were to remain at that location. Therefore, we included this cost in our payback period estimate. You expressed concern about whether these renovations would actually occur and requested that we provide a separate payback calculation that deletes the renovation cost. That payback period would be about 27 years. To determine the payback period, we assumed that all one-time costs would be incurred in the first year and savings would begin to accrue in the second year. We also discounted costs to take into account the future value of money. We used a discount rate of 3.8 percent.

#### SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

We based our review on documents obtained during meetings with officials from the Department of the Navy; NNPTC, Orlando; and the Naval Weapon Station, Charleston. We also reviewed documents on Navy and Base Closure and Realignment Commission work regarding the decisions in both 1993 and 1995 to relocate the Naval Training Center and NNPTC. We did not verify the Navy's data. We also visited the Naval Training Center in Orlando, Florida; the Navy's Center for Education and Training in Pensacola, Florida; and the Naval Weapons Station in Charleston, South Carolina.

We conducted our review between July and September 1996 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

## AGENCY COMMENTS AND OUR EVALUATION

In commenting on a draft of this report, DOD agreed that moving the Navy's Nuclear Power Propulsion School [NNPTC] to Charleston will require up front costs and result in lower annual operating costs. DOD noted that the cost analysis prepared by the Navy for the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission identified the costs for redirecting a move from New London to Charleston whereas our analysis focused on a direct cost comparison between Orlando and Charleston. DOD stated that without a mechanism to change the Commission's recommendation, the Department must implement it as directed. DOD also noted that both of our analyses showed that it is more cost effective to operate the NNPTC in Charleston. Our analysis showed Charleston had a lower annual operating cost but that it would take 20 years for this lower cost to payback the one-time up-front cost of moving to Charleston. DOD's comments are in enclosure I.

We are providing copies of this letter to the Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security; the Director, Office of Management and Budget; and the Secretaries of Defense and the Navy. We will also make copies available to others on request.

Please contact me at (202) 512-8412 if you or your staff have any questions about this letter. Major contributors to this letter were John Klotz, Assistant Director; Raymond C. Cooksey, Senior Evaluator; and Stephen DeSart, Senior Evaluator.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. WARREN,  
*Director, Defense Management Issues.*  
ENCLOSURE I

OFFICE OF THE  
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
*Washington, DC, November 20, 1996.*

Mr. DAVID R. WARREN,  
*Director, Defense Management Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. WARREN: This is in response to your draft report: "MILITARY BASES: Information Relating to The Movement Of A Navy Training Center", Dated October 15, 1996, (GAO Code 709223/OSD case 1241).

The Department agrees that implementing the Commission's recommendation to redirect the transfer of the Navy's Nuclear Power Propulsion School (NPPS) from the Naval Submarine Base New London to Naval Weapons Station Charleston requires up front costs and will result in lower annual operating costs. The Department also agrees that the different methodologies used by the GAO and the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to calculate implementation costs and savings result in different estimates of how long it may take to recover these costs.

The Navy prepared a separate Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) analysis for the BRAC 95 Commission to identify the costs for a redirect of the NPPS from New London to Charleston. This analysis included BRAC 93 funds cost avoidances due to the BRAC 95 recommendation to redirect the NPPS to Charleston instead of New London. The GAO analysis focused on the direct comparison of costs between Orlando and Charleston and did not include the cost avoidances identified by the Navy.

Regardless of the methodologies used or the differences in calculated costs and savings, both the GAO and the Department agree that it is more cost effective to operate the Nuclear Power Propulsion School in Charleston. Furthermore, without a mechanism

to change the recommendation the Department must implement it as the Commission directed.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide the Department's comments on the draft report.

ROBERT E. BAYER,  
*Principal Assistant Deputy Under Secretary (Industrial Affairs & and Installations).*

## ORDERING INFORMATION

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail: U.S. General Accounting Office, P.O. Box 6915, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015, or visit: Room 1100, 700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW), U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000 or by using fax number (301) 258-4066, or TDD (301) 413-0006.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to: info@www.gao.gov or visit GAO's World Wide Web Home Page at: <http://www.gao.gov>.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly sympathize with the gentleman's concerns, but I must insist on my point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill. Therefore it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. If I might, Mr. Chairman.

The reality is that this amendment deals with appropriations. It discusses that no funds appropriated in this act or any other act for any fiscal year may be used for military construction for a particular purpose. It does not deal with authorization. It deals with appropriations, and it deals with cutting off the funding sources that this Committee on Appropriations put forward and the House approved both in the past and in this Congress.

And so I would urge that it be germane. I believe that it is. I do not understand the anomalies that I am advised about this rule if it is ruled out of order. I think it should be in order.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I request a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Because the amendment does not confine its limitation to the funds in the pending bill, but instead applies it to other acts and other fiscal years as well, it must be held to constitute legis-

lation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained.

Are there other amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1998".

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CHAMBLISS] having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 178, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 14, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

YEAS—395

|              |             |             |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| Abercrombie  | Brown (FL)  | Davis (FL)  |
| Ackerman     | Bryant      | Davis (IL)  |
| Aderholt     | Bunning     | Davis (VA)  |
| Allen        | Burr        | Deal        |
| Andrews      | Burton      | DeFazio     |
| Archer       | Buyer       | DeGette     |
| Armey        | Callahan    | Delahunt    |
| Bachus       | Calvert     | DeLauro     |
| Baker        | Camp        | DeLay       |
| Baldacci     | Canady      | Deutsch     |
| Ballenger    | Cannon      | Diaz-Balart |
| Barcia       | Capps       | Dickey      |
| Barr         | Cardin      | Dicks       |
| Barrett (NE) | Carson      | Dingell     |
| Bartlett     | Castle      | Dixon       |
| Barton       | Chabot      | Doggett     |
| Bass         | Chambliss   | Dooley      |
| Bateman      | Chenoweth   | Doolittle   |
| Bentsen      | Christensen | Doyle       |
| Bereuter     | Clay        | Dreier      |
| Berman       | Clayton     | Duncan      |
| Berry        | Clement     | Dunn        |
| Bilbray      | Clyburn     | Ehlers      |
| Bilirakis    | Coble       | Ehrlich     |
| Bishop       | Coburn      | Emerson     |
| Blagojevich  | Collins     | Engel       |
| Bliley       | Combest     | English     |
| Blumenauer   | Condit      | Ensign      |
| Blunt        | Cook        | Eshoo       |
| Boehlert     | Cooksey     | Etheridge   |
| Boehner      | Costello    | Evans       |
| Bonilla      | Cox         | Everett     |
| Bonior       | Coyne       | Farr        |
| Bono         | Cramer      | Fawell      |
| Borski       | Crane       | Filner      |
| Boswell      | Crapo       | Flake       |
| Boucher      | Cubin       | Foglietta   |
| Boyd         | Cummings    | Foley       |
| Brady        | Cunningham  | Forbes      |
| Brown (CA)   | Danner      | Ford        |

|                |                |               |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Fowler         | Lewis (KY)     | Rogan         |
| Fox            | Linder         | Rogers        |
| Franks (NJ)    | Lipinski       | Rohrabacher   |
| Frelinghuysen  | Livingston     | Ros-Lehtinen  |
| Furse          | LoBiondo       | Rothman       |
| Galleghy       | Lofgren        | Roukema       |
| Ganske         | Lucas          | Roybal-Allard |
| Gekas          | Luther         | Rush          |
| Gephardt       | Maloney (CT)   | Ryun          |
| Gibbons        | Maloney (NY)   | Sabo          |
| Gilchrest      | Manton         | Salmon        |
| Gillmor        | Manzullo       | Sanchez       |
| Gonzalez       | Martinez       | Sanders       |
| Goode          | Mascara        | Sandlin       |
| Goodlatte      | Matsui         | Sanford       |
| Goodling       | McCarthy (MO)  | Sawyer        |
| Gordon         | McCarthy (NY)  | Saxton        |
| Goss           | McCollum       | Scarborough   |
| Graham         | McCrery        | Schaefer, Dan |
| Granger        | McDade         | Schaffer, Bob |
| Green          | McDermott      | Schumer       |
| Greenwood      | McGovern       | Scott         |
| Gutierrez      | McHale         | Serrano       |
| Gutknecht      | McHugh         | Sessions      |
| Hall (OH)      | McInnis        | Shaw          |
| Hall (TX)      | McIntosh       | Shays         |
| Hamilton       | McIntyre       | Sherman       |
| Hansen         | McKeon         | Shimkus       |
| Harman         | McKinney       | Shuster       |
| Hastert        | McNulty        | Skaggs        |
| Hastings (FL)  | Meehan         | Skeen         |
| Hastings (WA)  | Meek           | Skelton       |
| Hayworth       | Menendez       | Slaughter     |
| Hefley         | Metcalf        | Smith (MI)    |
| Hefner         | Mica           | Smith (OR)    |
| Herger         | Millender-Hill | Smith (TX)    |
| Hill           | McDonald       | Smith, Adam   |
| Hilleary       | Miller (CA)    | Smith, Linda  |
| Hilliard       | Miller (FL)    | Snowbarger    |
| Hinchey        | Mink           | Snyder        |
| Hinojosa       | Moakley        | Souder        |
| Hobson         | Molinar        | Spence        |
| Hoekstra       | Mollohan       | Spratt        |
| Holden         | Moran (KS)     | Stabenow      |
| Hooley         | Moran (VA)     | Stearns       |
| Horn           | Morella        | Stenholm      |
| Hostettler     | Myrick         | Stokes        |
| Houghton       | Nadler         | Strickland    |
| Hoyer          | Neal           | Stump         |
| Hulshof        | Nethercutt     | Stupak        |
| Hunter         | Neumann        | Sununu        |
| Hutchinson     | Ney            | Talent        |
| Hyde           | Northup        | Tanner        |
| Inglis         | Norwood        | Tauscher      |
| Istook         | Nussle         | Tauzin        |
| Jackson (IL)   | Obey           | Taylor (MS)   |
| Jackson-Lee    | Olver          | Thomas        |
| (TX)           | Ortiz          | Thompson      |
| Jefferson      | Owens          | Thornberry    |
| Jenkins        | Oxley          | Thune         |
| John           | Packard        | Thurman       |
| Johnson (CT)   | Pallone        | Tiahrt        |
| Johnson (WI)   | Pappas         | Tierney       |
| Johnson, E. B. | Parker         | Torres        |
| Johnson, Sam   | Pascrell       | Towns         |
| Jones          | Pastor         | Trafficant    |
| Kaptur         | Paxon          | Turner        |
| Kasich         | Payne          | Velazquez     |
| Kelly          | Pease          | Vento         |
| Kennedy (MA)   | Pelosi         | Visclosky     |
| Kennedy (RI)   | Peterson (MN)  | Walsh         |
| Kennelly       | Peterson (PA)  | Wamp          |
| Kildee         | Petri          | Waters        |
| Kilpatrick     | Pickering      | Watkins       |
| Kim            | Pickett        | Watt (NC)     |
| Kind (WI)      | Pitts          | Watts (OK)    |
| King (NY)      | Pombo          | Waxman        |
| Kingston       | Pomeroy        | Weldon (FL)   |
| Klecza         | Porter         | Weldon (PA)   |
| Klink          | Portman        | Weller        |
| Klug           | Poshard        | Wexler        |
| Knollenberg    | Price (NC)     | Weygand       |
| Kolbe          | Pryce (OH)     | White         |
| Kucinich       | Quinn          | Whitfield     |
| LaFalce        | Radanovich     | Wicker        |
| LaHood         | Rangel         | Wise          |
| Lampson        | Redmond        | Wolf          |
| Latham         | Regula         | Woolsey       |
| Lazio          | Reyes          | Wynn          |
| Leach          | Riley          | Young (AK)    |
| Levin          | Rivers         | Young (FL)    |
| Lewis (CA)     | Rodriguez      |               |
| Lewis (GA)     | Roemer         |               |

## NAYS—14

|              |            |          |
|--------------|------------|----------|
| Barrett (WI) | Frank (MA) | Oberstar |
| Campbell     | Markey     | Paul     |
| Conyers      | Minge      |          |

|         |               |       |
|---------|---------------|-------|
| Rahall  | Royce         | Stark |
| Ramstad | Sensenbrenner | Upton |

## NOT VOTING—25

|            |            |             |
|------------|------------|-------------|
| Baesler    | Gejdenson  | Schiff      |
| Becerra    | Gilman     | Shadegg     |
| Brown (OH) | Kanjorski  | Sisisky     |
| Dellums    | Lantos     | Smith (NJ)  |
| Edwards    | Largent    | Solomon     |
| Ewing      | LaTourette | Taylor (NC) |
| Fattah     | Lowe       | Yates       |
| Fazio      | Murtha     |             |
| Frost      | Riggs      |             |

□ 1918

Mr. NADLER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS) laid before the House the following communication from Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 711 of Public Law 104-293, I hereby appoint the following individual to the Commission to Assess the Organization of the Federal Government to Combat the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction:

Mr. Tony Beilenson, Maryland

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,  
Washington, DC, June 26, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 806(c)(1) of Public Law 104-132, I hereby appoint the following individual to the Commission on the Advancement of Federal Law Enforcement:

Mr. Gilbert Gallegos, Albuquerque, NM

Yours very truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PICKERING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PICKERING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE AMERICAN FAMILY FARM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the year when we talk about corn being so high by the Fourth of July, I wish to talk briefly about the American family farm. The American family farm represents the heart and backbone of America. It reflects our values, our ideals, our heritage. Growing up in the heartland of this Nation in Nebraska, together with my brother Roger who is here today, I worked in farms and was surrounded by farms. The work ethic and the values I hold today stem from this upbringing. The community I now represent on the central coast of California actively participates in everything from cattle ranching to broccoli growing, to strawberry growing to wine cultivation.

This past week we celebrated our Nation's birthday. I participated in the Santa Barbara County Fair in Santa Maria, CA. The farmers there are worried about whether or not they will be able to pass their farms or ranches on to their children. Today's estate tax makes that very difficult, especially for these hardworking people in our district.

I strongly support efforts to protect the American family farm and provide estate tax relief for our Nation's hardworking farmers. Farmers and ranchers work long, hard hours over a lifetime to build their businesses. However, far too often the burden of costly estate taxes forces them to sell their land. This is especially prevalent in our district with soaring property values and continued suburban development. Not only do farmers and ranchers lose when their land is sold but we all lose. We lose open space, we lose a critical sense of community.

The American Farmland Trust just published a report entitled Farming on the Edge. This report lists farmlands on the central coast of California as one of the 20 most threatened agricultural regions in the Nation. The report warns that the U.S. population is expected to jump 50 percent by the mid-21st century and high quality farmlands will shrink 13 percent. During the same period the Nation could become a net food importer instead of a net food exporter.

Mr. Speaker, we just cannot allow this to happen. This is why I am supporting legislation to provide needed estate tax relief to our Nation's family farmers and ranchers. Fortunately this message is being heard throughout the country. Both tax bills on the House floor last month addressed estate tax relief. The President agrees and has made estate tax relief for family farmers and businesses one of his top priorities. I have cosponsored a bipartisan