

amendments and regular amendments, thereby preempting the privileged motion to rise and report.

That was never the intent of the rule when it was first adopted at the beginning of the 98th Congress in 1983. The idea was to dispose of all regular amendments at the end of the reading of the bill for amendment before entertaining any limitation amendments. Once the limitation amendment process was underway, the motion to rise and report would be privileged at any time.

The language in the rule we have before us draws a clear line of demarcation by making the motion to rise and report in order after the last few lines of the bill are read by the Clerk.

Prior to the reading of the last few lines, the Chair would inquire of the Committee of the Whole whether there were any further amendments not precluded by clauses 2(a) or 2(c). If none are offered at that point, the Chair would direct the Clerk to read the last few lines of the bill.

At any point thereafter, the majority leader or a designee may offer the privileged motion to rise and report. That motion would take precedence over any pending limitation amendment or any regular amendment as well.

In summary, the purpose of this language is to draw a bright line between the regular amendment process and the limitation amendment process at the end of the reading of the bill for amendment. The only change made in clause 2(d) at the beginning of this Congress was to ensure that the motion to rise and report would be controlled by the majority leadership and not just the Appropriations Committee chairman acting alone.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and the bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include extraneous and tabular material on the consideration of H.R. 3517.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442 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. 3517.

□ 1121

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. 3517) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. LATOURETTE 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 the first time.

Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. It is my pleasure to present to the House the recommendations for the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. The funding contained in H.R. 3517 totals \$10 billion, is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation, and represents a \$1.2 billion, or 10 percent, decrease from last year.

Mr. Chairman, from the outset, we have worked closely with the National Security Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities and are supporting only those items contained in the House-passed authorization bill.

Public attention has recently focused on the problems our subcommittee has been citing for several years: the quality of military housing for unaccompanied personnel and those with families, the necessity for support facilities, and the importance of providing an adequate working environment to improve productivity and readiness. The committee has heard testimony from many different individuals and organizations regarding these problems, and we continue to feel strongly that the funds in this bill significantly contribute to the readiness and retention of our military personnel.

The recommendations before the House today deal with the critical problem of underfunding in these areas. The budget request of \$9.1 billion represents a decrease of over \$2 billion, or 18 percent, from current spending. While there are many aspects of the request that are commendable, there are areas of concern, particularly in the unaccompanied personnel and family housing arenas. For example, the report on the Quality of Life Task Force, chaired by former Secretary of the Army Jack Marsh, cites that 62 percent of the barrack spaces and 64 percent of family housing units are unsuitable. Yet, while the Department has com-

mitted itself to a serious barracks revitalization program, the request for barracks construction is \$65 million, or 10 percent below last year. And, family housing construction and operation and maintenance accounts are reduced by \$405 million.

Mr. Chairman, these reductions are not acceptable to this committee and, therefore, we are recommending an additional \$900 million above the budget request. Of these additional funds, roughly \$680 million, or 75 percent, has been devoted to barracks, family housing and child development centers.

Of the total \$10 billion recommendations, \$4.3 billion, or 43 percent, is for construction and operations and maintenance of family housing. It is imperative that a sustained overall commitment to funding levels be maintained that will reduce deficits and increase the quality of living conditions. The recommendations in this bill signify congressional commitment to meet that goal.

Thirty-one percent, or \$3.2 billion, is devoted to military construction for facilities that support our service members and their families and improve productivity and readiness. Included under these accounts is \$776 million to address the substandard housing troops must live in; \$313 million for hospital and medical facilities; \$132 million for chemical weapons demilitarization; \$88 million for environmental compliance; and \$34 million for child development centers.

In addition, a significant portion of this appropriation, \$2.5 billion, is to continue the ongoing downsizing of DOD's infrastructure through the base realignment and closure program. The implementation of base closures requires large upfront costs to ensure eventual savings, and this funding will keep closures ongoing and on schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the subcommittee for their help in bringing this bill to the floor. We have worked in a bipartisan manner to produce a bill which addresses the needs of today's military. I want to express my deep appreciation to Mr. HEFNER for his commitment to this subcommittee. He has worked hard for many years to provide the badly needed improvements for the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. His dedication to this process is invaluable.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this \$10 billion is only 4 percent of the total defense budget and a \$1.2 billion decrease from last year's appropriation. But, this \$10 billion directly supports the men and women in our Armed Forces; it increases productivity, readiness and recruitment, all very vital to a strong national defense. I ask my colleagues to join us in passing this bill.

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

FY 1997 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3517)

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Military construction, Army	633,814,000	434,723,000	603,584,000	-30,230,000	+168,861,000
Rescission	-6,385,000			+6,385,000	
Total, Military construction, Army (net)	627,429,000	434,723,000	603,584,000	-23,845,000	+168,861,000
Military construction, Navy	554,636,000	525,346,000	724,476,000	+169,840,000	+199,130,000
Rescissions	-6,385,000		-12,000,000	-5,615,000	-12,000,000
Total, Military construction, Navy (net)	548,251,000	525,346,000	712,476,000	+164,225,000	+187,130,000
Military construction, Air Force	587,234,000	603,059,000	678,914,000	+91,680,000	+75,855,000
Rescissions	-15,150,000			+15,150,000	
Total, Military construction, Air Force (net)	572,084,000	603,059,000	678,914,000	+106,830,000	+75,855,000
Military construction, Defense-wide	640,357,000	812,945,000	772,345,000	+131,988,000	-40,600,000
Rescissions	-41,866,000			+41,866,000	
Total, Military construction, Defense-wide (net)	598,491,000	812,945,000	772,345,000	+173,854,000	-40,600,000
Total, Active components	2,346,255,000	2,376,073,000	2,767,319,000	+421,064,000	+391,246,000
Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund			10,000,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	137,110,000	7,600,000	41,316,000	-95,794,000	+33,716,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	171,272,000	75,394,000	118,394,000	-52,878,000	+43,000,000
Rescission	-6,700,000			+6,700,000	
Total, Military construction, Air National Guard (net)	164,572,000	75,394,000	118,394,000	-46,178,000	+43,000,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	72,728,000	48,459,000	50,159,000	-22,569,000	+1,700,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve	19,055,000	10,983,000	33,169,000	+14,114,000	+22,186,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	36,482,000	51,655,000	51,655,000	+15,173,000	
Total, Reserve components	429,947,000	194,091,000	294,693,000	-135,254,000	+100,602,000
Total, Military construction	2,776,202,000	2,570,164,000	3,072,012,000	+295,810,000	+501,848,000
Appropriations	(2,852,688,000)	(2,570,164,000)	(3,084,012,000)	(+231,324,000)	(+513,848,000)
Rescissions	(-76,486,000)		(-12,000,000)	(+64,486,000)	(-12,000,000)
NATO Security Investment Program	161,000,000	197,000,000	177,000,000	+16,000,000	-20,000,000
Supplemental appropriation	37,500,000			-37,500,000	
Total, NATO	198,500,000	197,000,000	177,000,000	-21,500,000	-20,000,000
Family housing, Army:					
Construction	116,656,000	75,013,000	176,603,000	+59,947,000	+101,590,000
Operation and Maintenance	1,335,596,000	1,212,466,000	1,257,466,000	-78,130,000	+45,000,000
Total, Family housing, Army	1,452,252,000	1,287,479,000	1,434,069,000	-18,183,000	+146,590,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:					
Construction	525,058,000	403,726,000	532,456,000	+7,398,000	+128,730,000
Operation and Maintenance	1,048,329,000	1,014,241,000	1,058,241,000	+9,912,000	+44,000,000
Total, Family housing, Navy	1,573,387,000	1,417,967,000	1,590,697,000	+17,310,000	+172,730,000
Family housing, Air Force:					
Construction	297,738,000	231,236,000	304,068,000	+6,330,000	+72,832,000
Operation and Maintenance	849,213,000	829,474,000	840,474,000	-8,739,000	+11,000,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force	1,146,951,000	1,060,710,000	1,144,542,000	-2,409,000	+83,832,000
Family housing, Defense-wide:					
Construction	3,772,000	4,371,000	4,371,000	+599,000	
Operation and Maintenance	30,467,000	30,963,000	30,963,000	+496,000	
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide	34,239,000	35,334,000	35,334,000	+1,095,000	
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund	22,000,000	20,000,000	35,000,000	+13,000,000	+15,000,000
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	75,586,000	36,181,000	36,181,000	-39,405,000	
Total, Family housing	4,304,415,000	3,857,671,000	4,275,823,000	-28,592,000	+418,152,000
Construction	(943,224,000)	(714,346,000)	(1,017,498,000)	(+74,274,000)	(+303,152,000)
Operation and Maintenance	(3,263,605,000)	(3,087,144,000)	(3,187,144,000)	(-76,461,000)	(+100,000,000)
Family Housing Improvement Fund	(22,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(+13,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
Homeowners Assistance Fund	(75,586,000)	(36,181,000)	(36,181,000)	(-39,405,000)	

FY 1997 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3517)—Continued

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part II	964,843,000	352,800,000	352,800,000	-612,043,000
Part III	2,148,480,000	971,925,000	971,925,000	-1,176,555,000
Part IV	784,569,000	1,182,749,000	1,182,749,000	+398,180,000
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts.....	3,897,892,000	2,507,474,000	2,507,474,000	-1,390,418,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	11,177,009,000	9,132,309,000	10,032,309,000	-1,144,700,000	+900,000,000
Appropriations	(11,253,495,000)	(9,132,309,000)	(10,044,309,000)	(-1,209,186,000)	(+912,000,000)
Rescissions	(-76,486,000)	(-12,000,000)	(+64,486,000)	(-12,000,000)

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

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1997 military construction bill, and I want to compliment the distinguished chairwoman of the military construction subcommittee for her work. The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] has worked hard to produce a good bill that responds to the highest priorities needs of our service men and women, and she has done so in a bipartisan way.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I have in the past emphasized the importance of providing adequate funding for quality of life projects. It is easy to pay lip service to the importance of addressing our needs for military family housing and barracks, and we on the subcommittee understand providing our men and women in the military with a decent place to live is a key to military readiness and retention, and with this bill we continue to make important progress on this issue.

The bill contains \$10 billion in total funding and is consistent with a 602(b) allocation. All the projects are included in the authorization bill as passed by the House. There is \$4.3 billion in the bill for family housing, and \$777 million for new barracks, all very important projects. Recognizing the importance of family housing, barracks and child development centers, the bill includes \$545 billion beyond the President's request for badly needed facilities. I believe that is \$545 million; it is not that much of an increase. I think it is a typographical error.

At Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force bases, several important projects are being funded, including significant improvements for family housing and medical facilities as well as acquisition of additional and needed funding for Fort Bragg.

□ 1130

Mr. Chairman, with all the various interaction of base closures, bottom-up reviews, and 5-year plans, there has been a lot of pressure for significant reductions in funds for family housing. I am very pleased that this bill continues our bipartisan effort to address the quality-of-life issues for both enlisted personnel and families of military members. It may not seem that glamorous to fund barracks, family housing, and child care centers, but if Members have any exposure to the military way of life, they know that providing a decent place to live is an important factor in military readiness.

This bill also takes care of many other critical needs of the Department, including the base closure and construction and cleanup requirements, critically needed medical facilities, major new homeporting facilities, and other operational upgrades.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I just want to joint that chorus of folks that have complimented the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for doing an excellent job in a very, what I like to refer to as a nonpartisan way. This is probably the most nonpartisan committee on the Hill, and if we had more cooperation in other committees such as we have in this committee, we probably could get a lot more things done than we do around here. I wish her very well and the very best in her retirement, and I hope that she gets to play all the golf that she wants to play.

As a very dear friend of mine, and I mentioned this in the Committee on Rules today, who has passed on now, has said in all of his closing speeches, talking about individuals, he always said: "I hope you live as long as you want and never want as long as you live," and I hope that for you. I hope the gentlewoman has a long and happy retirement and I hope we see her from time to time in Washington, if we are all fortunate enough to be back here.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who also serves as a member of our Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Nevada, for yielding time to me.

I also wanted to thank the distinguished ranking minority member and former chairman of the subcommittee for his remarks and for his support for the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of the bill, but I also rise in tribute to the distinguished chairwoman of the subcommittee. She has done an outstanding job over these many years, and she has brought a great bill to the floor at this time.

The President, of course, has asked for \$12 billion less in the overall defense budget than what we appropriated last year. In this particular subcommittee, he asked for about \$2 billion less than we appropriated last year. Under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Nevada, the chairwoman of this subcommittee, we struck a compromise between what the President wanted and what we appropriated last year, and we are providing \$10 billion for such things as family housing units privatization, barracks privatization, child development centers, hospital and medical facilities, environmental compliance, and demolition of dilapidated, excess facilities. So there is a lot of good in here, and I think it is reflective of the character of all of the members of the subcommittee, and especially its chairman, the

gentlewoman from Nevada, BARBARA VUCANOVICH.

If I may, I would like to just take a minute to point out that she has been in Congress a number of years, having not held elective office before she came, but she has represented the people of Nevada in exemplary fashion. She currently serves as the Republican Conference secretary. She gave up her position on the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, where she had tremendous interest in trying to take care of the needs of her State and involving herself in issues of great interest, such as revision of the mining laws and other things affecting western lands and western States, in order to take this chairmanship, and she just ran with it; and she has really done tremendous work in trying to meet the needs of the young people in uniform and providing for their assistance, their living standards, where, unfortunately, we have found in years past far too many people in uniform live in dilapidated and substandard housing.

The gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] has toed the line and has worked very hard with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] to upgrade those conditions, eliminate that problem, and make sure all people are well taken care of.

I think she has produced a bill, a bipartisan bill, as the gentleman from North Carolina has pointed out, that can pass and should be signed into law, despite the fact it is \$1 billion over what the President asked for. I think this is because the Members of Congress in this body have looked after the needs of the service people and have met those needs within the budget confines with which we are currently faced.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentlewoman, I thank her for her service, thank her for her work on this bill, and just as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] has said, I want to extend my very best wishes to her for a very long and happy retirement with her husband, George, and wish her and all her 5 children, 15 grandchildren, and 3 great-grandchildren, all of the best of everything that life has to offer.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], who is also retiring this year, and has done a tremendous job since he has been in Congress, especially for the veterans and for the military readiness and for quality of life for our troops in the military.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time, and I commend the chairman of the committee and the subcommittee for her wonderful work, and I look forward to seeing her in retirement.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. I did not have time to orient either side, but I have a problem. However, I do support the bill. I have a problem with the Army National Guard, and the gentleman from Colorado knows my complaint.

The Army National Guard was recommended by the President this year for military construction for the Army National Guard, which has over 2,000 units, about \$7 million from the President's request. The authorization committee from the Army National Guard came up with \$41 million.

My point is that, really, that is not enough money. Last year the Committee on Appropriations gave us \$137 million, so we are actually getting \$96 million less for the Army National Guard than we got last year. That is a tremendous decrease. I point out that of the total military budget, that the Reserves and National Guard are getting only 3 percent of the authorization budget, only 3 percent, yet they have 40 percent of the missions, they have 40 percent of the missions.

So this is out of line, and if we are going to depend on the Guard and Reserve more to carry on under the total force, we certainly should maybe next year, and I do not have an amendment to offer, but next time I would hope that whoever is here will try to give more funding for the Reserves in military construction.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the members of the committee that I, too, want to commend and congratulate the Chair of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and to personally thank her for the assistance she has given to this freshman Congressman as a member of her subcommittee. I also want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for the bipartisan approach that he and the members of the minority have taken with regard to this particular legislation. I rise, of course, in strong support of the bill.

During our subcommittee's hearings over these past few weeks, the predominant concern expressed was the continued deterioration of quality-of-life and infrastructure needs which support our military men and women. We all want to give our Armed Forces the best weapons systems, training, and equipment we can afford. Unfortunately, one area of the military that has not received as much attention in recent years has been this issue of brick and mortar.

In November 1994, the Department of Defense created a task force on the quality of life to assess the problems associated with military housing. On

February 28 of this year, the chairman of this task force, former Secretary of the Army John Marsh, reported the findings of the year-long study.

The findings of the task force were disturbing. With regard to military family housing, 64 percent of these homes were classified as unsuitable. With regard to barracks for our single troops, 62 percent of these barracks were considered substandard due to overcrowding and poor conditions. One-half of all military barracks were built 30 or more years ago, and one-fourth require continuous upkeep to deal with such problems as asbestos, corroded pipes, and inadequate ventilation.

The Department of Defense also faces a 160,000-unit shortfall in barracks space. It would take 40 years, according to current estimates, and \$8.5 billion to correct all of the deficiencies. Clearly, Mr. Chairman, whatever we are able to do today will fall far short of what we need to do to correct this situation.

The bill sends a clear message that we are going to take care of our military personnel. Family housing projects account for 43 percent of the bill. In addition, this bill provides \$2.5 billion for one-time costs associated with base realignment and closing. Furthermore, in an effort to meet the child care needs of military facilities, this bill sets aside \$34 million for child development centers.

Finally, like most of my colleagues, I am concerned about the budget deficit, the increasing national debt, which now exceeds \$5 trillion. This bill is fiscally responsible, Mr. Chairman. It is within our 602 allocations, and at the same time it addresses important quality-of-life and military issues. I commend the work of the subcommittee, I commend the work of our Chair and our ranking minority member, and I strongly urge the adoption of this military construction bill.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill because I believe it represents the wrong emphasis in spending priorities. I certainly appreciate the fact that the funding in this bill represents a cut of about \$1 billion below last year. The \$10 billion in spending contained in this bill, however, is higher than can be justified.

I certainly share with the previous speakers the concern about improving living conditions of men and women and families that are in our Armed Forces, but I cannot support spending on military construction at a level that is \$900 million above the President's request, given the budget constraints we are facing. The fact of the matter is that in order to provide additional spending in this bill and stay within the budget allocation, the Committee on Appropriations will have to make deeper cuts in spending for edu-

cation, agriculture, and other important domestic programs in subsequent appropriations bills. The issue is not just whether the programs and projects funded in this bill are for worthy causes, but can we justify the deep cuts in other programs necessary to pay for the additional increased spending in this bill; can we do it? I do not believe that we can.

Although I am opposed to this bill, I would like to compliment the managers of the bill and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the work that they have done in applying objective criteria to the unrequested projects included in the bill. As the cochair of the porkbusters coalition, I have offered amendments to this bill in past years in other appropriations bills in order to eliminate wasteful projects. I have consulted with my porkbuster colleagues about the bill, especially Senator MCCAIN, who is the Senate cochair of the porkbusters, who helped develop objective criteria for judging military construction projects.

We have concluded that the bill largely, and I emphasize the word "largely," adheres to the criteria developed by Senator MCCAIN. Members of the porkbusters coalition, I would like to emphasize, do not oppose all spending projects. We simply believe that spending projects should be subject to greater scrutiny than they have in the past, and while there is always room for improvement, this bill has undergone much greater scrutiny than previous bills, and for that I would like to commend the committee.

□ 1145

I am troubled by the number of projects funded in this bill that were not in the administration's request or in the Defense Department's long-range plan. I would like to suggest that what we ought to be doing is following a 3-part approach to spending in this area. First, we ought to have a definite dollar amount that we commit to spending, and that ought to be a goal, it ought to be a limit, and the subcommittee ought to live within it.

Second, we ought to be sticking with the plan that is in that dollar figure and we ought not to be approving spending on projects that are not within the plan. In this case, we have 42 projects, I am advised, that are not in the long-range Defense Department plan.

And, third, I submit that we should be moving away from itemizing projects in report language or in the bills themselves. Instead, we ought to be exercising our oversight function to make sure that the Defense Department or any other Federal agency is allocating the funds for certain project areas in a wise and prudent manner, but not micromanaging within our committees and subcommittees individual projects, because of the temptations that this provides for members of the committees and the subcommittees

to favor their own districts and projects that they feel are particularly important to them rather than the institution.

So, in sum, again I would like to compliment the committee and the subcommittee for their work, but say that I will be voting against this bill because of the fact that it spends \$900 million more than the President has requested, and it includes 42 projects that are not on the long-range plan that cost \$300 million in and of themselves.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3517, the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1997 and I urge my colleagues to support it.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I want to commend Chairman VUCANOVICH and Mr. HEFNER for their continued cooperation in working with those of us on the authorization committee charged with improving our military facilities. I want to echo Chairman VUCANOVICH's remarks that this bill fully conforms to the military construction authorizations passed by the House on May 15—just 2 weeks ago.

This legislation would continue the strong bipartisan support of the House for initiatives designed to slow the ongoing deterioration of military facilities critical to the Nation's defense and to the improvement of housing and other basic quality of life facilities.

Chairman VUCANOVICH has thoroughly described what is in the bill, but I want to take a moment to talk about some of the important improvements we have proposed to improve the quality of life of military personnel and their families.

Those who serve in the Nation's military know firsthand the difficult conditions in housing the military faces. Those who served in the past can often go into a barracks or a military family's home and find that it has not changed much over the years—in many cases for decades. Degraded and crumbling housing is simply unacceptable. Whether they are stationed at home or abroad, we owe the men and women who volunteer to serve this great Nation more than that and we are working hard to change it.

I am gratified by the commitment of the Secretary of Defense and the support of the service chiefs for measures to improve the quality of life for military personnel. However, I am disappointed that the administration did not back up that commitment as forcefully as it could have in its budget proposal to Congress.

For fiscal year 1997, the administration proposed steep cuts in troop housing, family housing, and child development centers. This legislation, as well as the authorization bill already passed

by the House, would take a number of important steps to shore up quality of life with an approximately \$675 million package of improvements to the President's budget request.

Twenty-one additional barracks projects, benefiting thousands of unaccompanied personnel, will benefit from the added funding. We seek to increase by nearly 5 times the amount of funding put toward new child development centers and we would make additional improvements to housing that will benefit over 3,500 military families.

We need to continue to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families as well as modernize our deteriorating military infrastructure. On a bipartisan basis, the authorization and appropriation committees have developed legislation that emphasizes the priority requirements of the military services and this legislation would put dollars only toward projects that can be executed in the coming fiscal year.

These are not imaginary requirements. The military services have indicated in testimony before the subcommittee which I chair that a military construction program that adequately addresses requirements and would begin to buy down the lingering facilities backlog would be two or three times the size of the current program. This bill proposes nothing quite that grand, but it would make a significant contribution toward resolving the problem.

Mr. Chairman, on a more personal note, I want to take this opportunity to reflect on the impending retirement of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, BARBARA VUCANOVICH.

BARBARA, we are going to miss you, I can tell you that from a very personal standpoint. I do not think there has ever been an authorizing chairman and an appropriations chairman that worked any closer than we did, or two committees that worked more closely or two staffs that worked more closely, and that is a tribute to your leadership. You did not consult with me before you made the decision to retire, and I resent that. I would have told you not to do it. We need you here. Good luck to you as you enter a new phase of your life and a new adventure.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do not disagree with anything that the gentleman said, but this is not a new phenomenon for administrations not to request as much money as we need. We can go back years and years and years.

Many years ago I went out to Fort Hood, TX. I saw some of the troops' wives trying to redo an old cafeteria for a day care center, and we said this is not acceptable. Not any administration since I have been here has put enough focus on quality of life and family housing in the military. It is not real sexy to go out and talk about building barracks and cutting the rib-

bons for a barracks, as it is for a B-1 bomber or a B-2 bomber, what have you, but it is critical for retention and for making the quality of life for our troops as well as we can.

We are so far behind. I remember just a few years ago, not only did we have a cut, we had a pause. We did not do anything in military construction. It was requested that we have a pause in military construction. We did not even keep up with the year before. So it is not a new phenomenon for us to have to go to try to put in extra money for quality of life and housing for our troops.

Mr. Chairman, I just remember talking, when Mr. RALPH REGULA was the ranking member, when I was chairman, we worked very hard for quality of life. In fact, it was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and myself that brought to the forefront burdensharing. We did not even have a subcommittee called burdensharing until we brought it to the forefront about burdensharing for our troops in these foreign countries.

So it is not a new phenomenon and it is not unique to any administration that they do not ask for enough money to do the job that we think needs to be done.

Mr. Chairman, having said that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here today and particularly to follow the chair of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], because I would like to echo his comments on the cooperation between the appropriations committee and the authorizing committee. In this particular instance, we are talking about quality of life, and I would like to follow then on the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] as well.

Unfortunately, the Department of Defense has come to rely upon us in Congress when it comes to budgetary matters with respect to quality of life. What happens is, on the procurement side, in the more exotic weapons systems, particularly those that cost a great deal of money, they push that part of the envelope right up to the edge, and then they count on Members of Congress to come through on questions of quality of life, whether it is barracks or family housing or what have you, child development centers, et cetera. And we have done that.

I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] for his bipartisan approach on it, the chair of the subcommittee; and my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for seeing to it that these quality of life issues have not been abandoned.

In particular, I can say in the area of the Pacific, we have dealt with Schofield Barracks and the renewal of barracks there, and we are very appreciative, and this year at Kaneohe for

the Marine Barracks. General Krulak, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, called very, very happy to see that we were going to start the phasing in of the new barracks proposals at Kaneohe in the State of Hawaii.

I will say that this has a further good effect. What this does is stop the competition for nonexistent rental housing between military families and civilian families. The result, the 6 years that I have been in office and the plan that I started out with and presented on a bipartisan basis, was that this would reduce rents, reduce the cost of living in Hawaii for civilian families and improve the quality of life for military families, I think a good result from that, and I am very grateful for it.

I have two other points that I would like to make very briefly. One, as a way of improving this, I hope and I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] has indicated that he has an interest in this, and other Republican members on our authorizing committee have indicated an interest in this, is that we start thinking about capital budgeting and start differentiating operating costs from capital costs, particularly using as a demonstration model perhaps quality of life issues in the military. We have started that.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] was instrumental in helping us put together legislation for public-private partnerships to see to it that we can get into capital expenditures. If we can differentiate capital expenditures from operating expenditures, I think we can make vast improvements in the quality of life area and demonstrate a way of moving toward more sensible spending patterns that will result not only in helping to balance the budget but in moving forward in a sensible way with our military budgeting.

So I am appreciative to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], and others who have helped support this issue.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say that when I was first elected in a special election in 1986, there was someone here who took me under his wing, that acted as a mentor to me, someone whom I believe to be an example of the true gentleman that exists in the House of Representatives, someone who will be more than missed, someone for whom I have the greatest possible respect, someone that we know and military families throughout the country will appreciate for decades to come because of his work at Fort DeRussy and Hale Koa to see that the recreation needs of our military are taken care of. All of us are going to miss with all of our hearts Representative SONNY MONTGOMERY from Mississippi.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join as a member of the Committee on National Security and a member of Mr. HEFLEY's Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities in thanking Chairman VUCANOVICH for her great work. It is a work that really has contributed so much to the men and women who wear uniforms for our country.

It has been mentioned a couple of times that we spend more money than the President has requested in military construction, but I think Mr. HEFNER hit the nail on the head when he pointed out that we always have paid more attention to the quality of life issues than the administrations, regardless of whether they are Democrat or Republican.

I am reminded that this bill that BARBARA VUCANOVICH helped to put together and Mr. HEFNER helped to put together that provides for military construction, the defense bill taken together with that important component is roughly \$100 billion less in real dollars than the 1985-86 Reagan defense budget. Because we were strong in the 1980's and because we brought down the Berlin Wall and dissolved the Soviet empire, we have been able to reduce defense expenditures. But beyond that, this bill also and the military construction budget that is an important part of the overall defense bill is in line and is consistent with the balanced budget program that the House leadership is moving forward with.

□ 1200

So this is not a budget buster. It is well within the confines of the dollar parameters that we have set.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say to gentlewoman from Nevada, who is one of the warmest, finest persons who has ever served in this body, we thank her for everything that she has brought to the deliberative process in the House of Representatives. She is a person of great wisdom, great intellect, and a big, big heart.

In another area, in the pro-life debates and the debates with respect to abortion, her speeches about "Heather the Feather" have touched everybody's heart. God bless her and thanks for her work.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3517, the fiscal year 1997 military construction appropriations bill.

The President's fiscal year 1997 request for military construction reflected a cut of 18 percent from fiscal year 1996 appropriated levels, even though the Defense Science Board's

quality of life task force found that 62 percent of military housing spaces and 64 percent of family housing units are unsuitable.

The bill helps correct this deficiency. While still below last year's appropriation, it significantly boosts the President's request for both new and renovated barracks and military family housing. This will address the concerns of many in today's military who are fed up with inadequate housing and are voting with their feet.

This bill supports other infrastructure improvements, as well. Earlier this year, for instance, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Pirie highlighted the Navy's need for significant investment in port infrastructure to ensure readiness. I am pleased H.R. 3517 recognizes the requirement, adding funding for projects such as wharf improvements at Naval Station Mayport.

Mr. Chairman, this bill improves the readiness of our Armed Forces. It merits our support.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I urge strong support of this bill. It is not as much as we would like to do. I suppose that will always be with the budget restrictions that we are under. I suppose we will never have enough money to do the things that we would like to do and would need to do, but I would just like to point out to those that would be critical of this bill that every item in this bill is authorized, and we have gone to great pains to see that the money is going to be targeted to where it would do the most good for quality of life for our Armed Forces.

So I think it is a good bill, it is a bill that I think that everybody can support, and I urge that everyone in the body would take a close look at it and I would strongly urge that we have a unanimous vote on this milcon bill. And again I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Nevada and wish her a very happy retirement, and I hope that this will be a resounding endorsement of this bill here today on the last vote that she will be bringing to this floor.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3517, the Military Construction bill for fiscal year 1997. I would like to thank the chairwoman of this committee, BARBARA VUCANOVICH, who has once again moved this bill swiftly through the Appropriations Committee, and I am sad to say will be doing it for the last time. I want to wish her well and would like to personally thank her for the service that she has provided to this important subcommittee and this institution. I would also like to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, BILL HEFNER, for his help and assistance in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, as both the chairwoman and the ranking member have noted, this bill provides \$10 billion in fiscal year 1997 for military construction, family housing and military base closure. This bill continues this committee's commitment to funding initiatives that upgrade the quality of life for the men and women of armed forces and families.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight, a few important projects in the bill that are crucial to the constituents of my district.

The first project is the ongoing renovation of the dormitories at Travis AFB. This bill provides funding for one dormitory scheduled for construction this year, and funding to speed up construction of a second dorm at Travis. Additionally, this bill includes \$8.6 million for the construction of 70 multi-family housing units for enlisted personnel stationed at Travis. These projects go a long way to improve Travis' housing situation. The construction of the dormitories is part of a base-wide project to upgrade and improve base housing in order to meet Air Force requirements.

This bill also provides funds to replace Travis' underground fueling system. The system was designed to provide a quick and efficient way to refuel two jets at one time. Travis currently relies on an underground system from the 1950's, which often fails because of electrical shorts which occur after rainstorms. The new fuel system is safer and more efficient than the fuel trucks on the runway. It will also put an end to the occasional leaks which are so bad for the environment.

Mr. Chairman, these upgrades are a clear sign that Travis is, and will remain, vital to the Air Force mission. These improvements in modernization will ensure that the base will meet that mission.

Finally, this bill provides for two projects at Beale AFB: the closure of landfill No. 2 and for the CARS Deployable Ground Station Support Facility. Each of these projects are important to the continued mission at Beale.

Mr. Chairman, each of the initiatives I have outlined will help maintain Travis and Beale AFB as critical defense assets and as integral parts of their respective communities.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my support for this important military readiness bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment at the lack of funding in this bill for National Guard Armories, and to urge the Secretary of the Army to include construction funds for armories in next year's budget request.

When the authorizing committee for military construction, the House Military Construction and Facilities Subcommittee, held hearings on the fiscal year 1997 Department of Defense [DOD] authorization bill, the chairman was clear about his position on armories. No request means no funding, and no Member additions would be included in the bill.

This was not a new position. Last year, Chairman HEFLEY informed the Department of the Army and the Army National Guard that no armories would be funded until they were requested from the department in their annual budget request. Unfortunately, that advice was ignored this year and no armories were requested. The army knows how to solve this problem, and the ball is in their court.

As my colleagues on the National Security Committee know from my repeated speeches on this subject, the Guam Army National Guard is the only National Guard unit without an armory. At the same time, the Guam Army National Guard is one of the most recognized units in the nation, having received awards for the best recruiting and retention of any other unit in the country.

The construction of an armory for the Guam Army National Guard is a priority within the

National Guard Bureau. Only recently, it was included in the \$250 million priority list forwarded to the congressional defense committees at Senator REID's request.

I am pleased that the Department of the Army is now rethinking how it funds armories and has begun a dialog with the relevant committees. In order to meet the construction needs of our National Guard units, I urge the Department of the Army to include funding for armories, including a much-needed armory for the Guam Army National Guard, in next year's budget request.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I am unable to cast my vote in support of H.R. 3517, the Military Construction Appropriation Act, because I must attend the funeral of my friend and constituent, Seymour H. Knox III, of Buffalo.

H.R. 3517 underscores this Congress' continuing commitment to America's service personnel and their families, including many of my constituents who serve on the Niagara Falls Air Base. The bill also reflects a continuing commitment to the American taxpayer by calling for a \$1.2 billion reduction from last year's level of \$11.2 billion—keeping us on the path toward our ultimate goal of reaching a balanced budget by the year 2002.

According to the Quality of Life Task Force chaired by former Secretary of the Army Jack Marsh, 62 percent of troop housing and 64 percent of family housing units are currently unsuitable. This bill helps correct this deficiency.

Included in this legislation is \$1 billion for family housing construction and improvements benefiting over 10,000 military families. In addition, the bill includes: \$36 million for the Homeowners Assistance Fund; \$34 million for child development centers; \$313 million for hospital and medical facilities; and \$88 million for environmental compliance.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that the move to privatize functions of the Department of Defense is apparently running into some snags when it comes to work being performed on the approximately 3,000 armories located all across our Nation, and at facilities located overseas.

First of all, I want to make certain that I am fully understood on this point, for I do not intend to detract from or denigrate any members of the National Guard and the Reserves.

Quite simply, my concern is that much of the work being performed through the Reserved Component Automation System could be resulting in additional costs, delays, and inefficiencies.

The Reserved Component Automation System program consists of installing electrical circuits and local-area-network [LAN] cable and devices in preparation for computers at armories throughout the Nation.

Apparently, the Department of Defense has determined that it cannot afford to perform this work at some of the smaller facilities through the use of outside contractors and, instead, is considering using army personnel for this work.

Again, I am not questioning the skills, talents, and capabilities of members of the Guard and Reserves, but when there are small businesses in the private sector that have a proven track record of performing such work, I am concerned that local firms and local workers are being left out of the kind of work they customarily perform, typically at the lowest cost and with the greatest efficiency and best quality.

Mr. Chairman, a firm in my district has performed electrical and computer wiring work in as many as 70 armories, and the work they perform is of the highest quality and efficiency, and frequently at the lowest costs.

I would like to request of the distinguished chairwoman, my friend from Nevada, that we fully explore the best use of the funds that we appropriate through the Reserved Component Automation System and that we continue to apply very high standards, standards that call for cost-savings, high-quality, and greater efficiencies.

FEBRUARY 23, 1996.

Congressman BART STUPAK,
*Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

Subject: Reserve/Armory projects.

DEAR BART: We have recently been advised that a contract has been issued to Boeing to perform the tasks we discussed on the larger sites in each State plus Europe. The contract is apparently a long term one and only for the large sites.

The information still indicates the government plans to complete the rest of the sites with armory personnel or individual contractors and since this is the arena we hoped to participate in, the door may be open.

Please let me know how I can assist you.

Sincerely,

RONALD C. LINDBERG,
Rapid Electric Sales & Service.

The Government has issued contracts for a Reserved Component Automation System which Rapid Electric has participated in by doing most of the armories in Michigan.

The project consists of installing electrical circuits and LAN cable and devices in preparation for computers.

The Government has determined it can't afford to do the smaller sites as originally planned and is considering using the armory personnel for the electrical and LAN installation.

We offer an alternative:

Rapid Electric has licensed electricians trained and experienced in these installations and can complete the work in a timely and professional manner while maintaining a cost within the allocated budget.

The work would be completed using our already trained personnel along with licensed electricians from the communities and states where the armory is located.

We would be consistent with the goals of privatization and putting people to work as well as complying with the local codes and licensing laws.

Using nonqualified, nonlicensed personnel for installation of a national defense system is commercial senselessness. If we can't afford to do it right we are better off not to do it at all. It's better to work without a system than to depend on one that doesn't work.

The Government is expected to have an armory ready for the computer people when they arrive. If the electrical and LAN work isn't complete or does not operate when they arrive there is added expense and delay for rescheduling and return trips.

If the system fails when needed, it is of no value.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3517, the military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

This bill properly focuses on improving the quality of life for our service men and women and their families. This bill provides for new barracks and family housing, child care and medical facilities, and environmental compliance projects; \$776 million will be expended

for new barracks; \$34 million is appropriated for construction and improvement to day care centers and \$48 million for energy conservation programs within the Department of Defense.

In Texas, \$35,000,000 will go to construction and renovation of barracks at Fort Hood. Brooks Air Force Base and Dyess Air Force Base will receive \$5,895,000 and \$4,613,000 respectively.

At Brooks Air Force Base in Texas, \$5,400,000 will be appropriated for a student dormitory. Dyess Air Force Base will receive \$5,895,000 for improvements to their student dormitory facility.

Statewide, Texas will receive \$6,500,000 aimed at general life safety upgrade for military personnel and their families in Texas.

I am proud to support this bill that provides for these types of quality of life programs which stress the importance of providing a healthy, happy, environment for the many families who live and work on military bases in my home State of Texas and across the country.

These young men and women are making a tremendous sacrifice in the service of our country and they deserve the improvements that this bill will make in their daily lives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for his kind words, and I also urge support for this bill. I think it is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have no more 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 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.

After the reading of the final lines of the bill, a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted shall, if offered by the majority leader or a designee, have precedence over a motion to amend.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3517

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, 1997, 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, \$603,584,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$54,384,000 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

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

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, \$724,476,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$50,959,000 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: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-136, \$6,900,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 102-380, \$2,800,000 is hereby rescinded: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated for "Military Construction, Navy" under Public Law 103-110, \$2,300,000 is hereby rescinded.

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, \$678,914,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$47,387,000 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, \$772,345,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be de-

termined 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 \$12,239,000 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.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That subject to thirty days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Fund from amounts appropriated in this Act for the acquisition or construction of military unaccompanied housing in "Military Construction" accounts, to be merged with and to be made available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided further*, That appropriations made available for the Fund in this Act shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans and loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military unaccompanied housing and ancillary supporting facilities.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$41,316,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$118,394,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

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, \$50,159,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

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, \$33,169,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

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, \$51,655,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001.

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, \$177,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$176,603,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,257,466,000; in all \$1,434,069,000.

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, \$532,456,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,058,241,000; in all \$1,590,697,000.

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, \$304,068,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$840,474,000; in all \$1,144,542,000.

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, \$4,371,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001; for Operation and Maintenance, \$30,963,000; in all \$35,334,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING
IMPROVEMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, subject to thirty days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Fund from amounts appropriated in this Act for construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with

and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided further*, That appropriations made available to the Fund in this Act shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of Chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For use in the Homeowners Assistance Fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3374), \$36,181,000, to remain available until expended.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT,
PART II

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$352,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$223,789,000 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), \$971,925,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$351,967,000 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), \$1,182,749,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$200,841,000 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.

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.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, through page 19, line 17, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. FURSE

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. FURSE: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for renovation, repair, or other military construction project in connection with Spinelli Barracks or Taylor Barracks, Mannheim, Germany.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY" is hereby reduced by \$17,400,000.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment before I start and express my deep appreciation to the ranking member of this committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and how much wonderful work he does for military personnel,

and also to our retiring chairperson, she has also done such great work.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, which is endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste, reduces the Army military construction account by \$17.4 million. That \$17.4 million is the cost of renovating two barracks in Mannheim, Germany.

There are three reasons why I offer this amendment. The first is that these renovations were not requested by the Department of Defense; second, they are not in the Army's 6-year future defense plan; and, third, Mr. Chairman, we are about to undertake a fundamental reevaluation of our present worldwide troop deployment patterns and it seems to me this is not the time to be committing ourselves to an over \$17 million remodeling project.

My colleagues will recall the Shays-Frank burdensharing amendment. It passed the House overwhelmingly by a vote of 353 to 62 during consideration of the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization. This amendment required a report on alternative configuration, due March 1, 1997.

Now, I certainly support the effort to improve quality of life for our troops; however, the U.S. taxpayers should not be asked to pick up the tab for this installation in Europe. The United States should negotiate with the Germans to make these renovations part of their contribution.

The Japanese Government gives about 79 percent of the nonpersonnel costs incurred in stationing our troops in their country, but none of our NATO allies, not even Germany, has agreed to kick in a dime for the renovation at Mannheim. This is yet another way that the Europeans end up paying just 24 percent of U.S. nonpersonnel costs and investing their own money in other things of value.

There are better ways, it seems to me, to spend this \$17 million than in renovating barracks in Europe. In my own State of Oregon, our National Guard was told that if projects were not part of DOD long-range plans they would not be added to this bill. Well, the barracks in Germany were not part of the plan and they got funding for \$17 million.

And the question I think we need to ask, if this is indeed a priority, is why did the Department of Defense not include these renovations in their request?

It is very important at this time that we are reviewing our overseas presence, and I believe that while we do that review we should set our priorities better than the one in this bill that my amendment would address.

The Furse amendment, is, as I said, endorsed by Citizens Against Government Waste and Taxpayers for Common Sense. I urge that Members support my amendment and save \$17 million that we can well use in military construction in this country.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The amendment, I think, fundamentally misrepresents the situation on the ground in Germany and is a direct assault on the young men and women that are stationed there, young Americans who are in many cases now deployed in Bosnia.

I believe that deployment to Bosnia was supported by the gentlewoman from Oregon, but when we bring those troops back from the miserable situation in Bosnia to Germany, she wants them still to have a miserable living situation, it would appear, when they get back there.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I want to remind the House these barracks projects have already been considered by the House. Just 2 weeks ago, the House passed the military construction authorization for the coming fiscal year as part of the defense authorization bill. No one challenged these barracks improvements at the time. No one offered an amendment, and these projects have been fully supported on a bipartisan basis throughout the committee process.

Moreover, these projects are also included in the defense authorization bill, which is reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee. We recognize the degraded and difficult living conditions of our soldiers in Germany, and so has the Army. The Army has not dedicated any military construction funding to barracks in Germany since before the drawdown began in 1989. Well, the drawdown is over, and we know where these troops are going to remain.

On April 10, 1996, I wrote to each of the military departments to determine the high priority unfunded requirements in military construction. Maj. Gen. Frank Miller, the Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army for Installation Management, responded to me on April 18. He indicated that these two projects were high priority unfunded requirements.

In testimony before the subcommittee that I chair, I asked Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Economic Security where the department would put additional funding if it became available. Here is what he said: "I think that were we to have additional funds, the place that really needs the most attention is our overseas bases, and particularly in Europe." He went on to say that "what we are asking of those people and the conditions that they are finding themselves in are pretty abysmal." "Abysmal" is the word he used.

□ 1215

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Furse amendment, and I am deeply interested in the comments of the previous speaker. The gentleman certainly raises issues that are of concern to all of us. Our troops in Bosnia are important to each American, their well-being, and their support.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe that it is our expectation that

the troops in Bosnia will be withdrawn by the end of the year, or certainly sometime next year, and it is far from clear that these apartment units, these housing quarters are going to be completed in time for them to occupy them.

It is our hope and prayer, of course, that these troops will be home in the United States before then. So, I think that it is a red herring to claim that these units are for our troops in Bosnia.

Second, I would point out that the Armed Forces themselves have not included this barracks project in their long-term plan. Why is it we are building additional housing units in Europe at the instigation of the committees in Congress, when the Defense Department itself has not placed a priority on these units? I submit that this is not a responsible use of taxpayer dollars.

Third, it is important to note that we have a study underway pursuant to the request by Congress for how we should handle burdensharing obligations. Is it responsible for us to jump in and say that we should spend \$17.4 million building these barracks when this study is in progress and when the Defense Department has not requested funds for the barracks themselves?

I think that the Furse amendment represents a modest, responsible, prudent approach to budgeting and that all of us would be well-advised to support this amendment to save the American taxpayer dollars or if these are dollars that must be spent according to the committee's calculations, to invest these dollars in facilities that would serve the American Armed Forces for a longer period of time and not violate the mandate from Congress with respect to the burdensharing study.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that we are not quibbling here over whether we are going to do something for the men and women in the Armed Forces or for our veterans. All of us agree that we ought to support the folks in the service. The question is what is responsible with respect to the American taxpayer, and how do we work effectively as a legislative body with the administrative branch to make these decisions?

Again, if the Defense Department itself has not included this project in its long-term plan, why are we leaping in at this point in time to second guess those experts?

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, one of the things I would like to point out is that there are many needs for barracks in the United States. I would point out one place in Oregon where we do training in central Oregon. We train about 500 person-days a year, and there the trainees sleep on the armory floor and they use Porta-potties. They would love to have a barracks, but they were told, the National Guard was told it

was not in the long-range plan, they would not be able to apply for these.

We are again saying this was not in the long-range plan, it was not requested, and we would like to see the long-range report completed first and make sure that our allies pick up the cost of some of these housing that then become part of their housing stock.

So, I would point out that many of the barracks need remodeling here in this country and our Army National Guard really does need to have some of that money spent on their local barracks, and I would suggest that is probably a better use of money, but it should have been authorized, or rather it should have been requested and I believe it must be in the long-range plan to be a conservative use of our taxpayers' money.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also like to report that we checked with the German embassy and we were advised that apartments can be rented in the Mannheim area for \$750 a month for a 2-bedroom apartment. If we have a need for housing for our troops on an interim or swing period of time especially the troops in Bosnia, why do not we utilize the market that is available in the area to provide that housing on a temporary basis? I submit that building housing or building barracks that probably would have a life expectancy of 40 years is not a responsible use of money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill. I have come down to the floor for the express purpose of saying what a joy it has been to serve on the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. She has been one of the outstanding members and leaders not only on our Committee on Appropriations but in this House of Representatives and in the Republican Party.

She has been unfailingly helpful and cooperative with all the Members. It has been a joy to be a part of her subcommittee. As I said at the markup, she could give all of the rest of us subcommittee chairmen lessons in how to mark up a bill in an efficient way and get the job done for the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has done an outstanding job in crafting this bill that addresses the quality of life and needs of our Armed Services, and this bill includes increased funding for troops' barracks quarters, for new family housing units, for private family homes, for child development centers.

All of these items are essential to the readiness of our Armed Forces. It is a disgrace to see the substandard housing facilities in which we have sometimes allowed the men and women who serve our country to live. They deserve the very best we can provide.

Under the leadership of Chairman VUCANOVICH, this bill takes very strong

steps toward improving those conditions and I think she has done a masterful job in crafting the bill. I fully support it, and the fact that the gentlewoman is retiring, I want her to know that I believe it is a tremendous loss to the Congress and to the country to see her enter retirement. She is going to be missed very much, and I have been proud to serve under her chairmanship of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Furse amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I applaud the subcommittee this year and the full committee as well, for the bill itself is \$1.1 billion less than last year's spending bill, which I think is a step in the right direction.

However, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am dismayed that it is still \$900 million more than what the Pentagon asked for. This amendment seeks to cut \$17 million of the \$900 million in unrequested funds. The money is designated, as the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] indicated, for barracks improvements in Germany.

While there is nothing wrong with improving the quality of life for our troops, there is something wrong in asking the taxpayer to spend \$17.5 million for a military project that the Pentagon does not have in its long-range plan. It did not request it, and consequently it must not see the need for this project.

Mr. Chairman, I know that it is hard to cut spending. We do not win a lot of battles, and I regret that this amendment is likely to fail. I wish that we had the line-item veto in effect for this year's spending appropriations instead of next year's. It would have been a good first test. But unfortunately it does not start until next year.

Mr. Chairman, \$17 million is a lot of money. It is a lot of money in anybody's checkbook, whether it be the Federal Government's or somebody else's. And if we are going to start in cutting back on waste and unneeded projects, this is where we ought to start.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to join with me and the Citizens Against Government Waste and the Taxpayers for Common Sense in supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, for a couple of reasons, one, I do not like to be on the wrong side of Citizens Against Government Waste because I am a citizen and I am against government waste, and second, I reluctantly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. I think it is ill-advised.

What we are doing here, we are not—and someone mentioned projects all across the Nation. Well, there is no doubt about that. There are projects that need to be done. And \$17 million would not address many projects in all

the many States, the requests that we have here. But the only thing we are going to do, if we adopt this amendment, the only people it is going to hurt is going to be the troops that are stationed there. And we are going to continue to have the poor living conditions there. It was not requested. We understand that. But it was a high priority when we talked to the military people that were responsible for the living conditions for those people there. It was a high priority with them.

But in many cases over the years, people have not requested these funds because it was not a higher priority with them because they had so many other things and the budget crunch came. But they need these funds.

The gentlewoman has linked her amendment to a burdensharing amendment that passed the House in the Armed Services bill. I do not believe that any redeployment of our troops will affect the Army at Mannheim, Germany. The fact of the matter is that we are consolidating our forces there, and it serves as a major railhead for the Armed Forces in Europe. In fact, it was recently used to send troops and equipment to Bosnia.

Someone mentioned that they had talked with the German Housing Authority, and I respect that, but I doubt very seriously if the Germany Housing Authority could supply the number of apartments that we would need to accommodate our soldiers that are stationed there. Plus, they are enlisted men; they do not have the kind of resources that would be needed to live on the economy in Germany.

It is true that the Germany Government owes us over \$200 million based on cost sharing reached in the understanding with many United States facilities. However, having said that, cutting these funds from this bill is not in any way going to affect the behavior of the German Government. It has been our contention for many years that we do not put enough pressure on our allies about burdensharing, but we are doing better with the Japanese, the Germans and everybody that is concerned.

This project will not actually replace but refurbish facilities built in 1940. I was 10 years old when they began occupying these facilities and that goes back a long, long way.

I certainly respect the gentlewoman's endeavor here and her commitment to it, but I think it is ill-advised and I would hope that the Members of Congress would look at this, look at the whole picture, and realize that this is not the way for us to go.

□ 1230

So, reluctantly, at the threat of being on the wrong side of Citizens Against Government Waste and my dear friend from Oregon, I would request that Members look at this entire bill and see it for what it is, a good bill. The priorities are set. There is no money that is being wasted. This

money will be put to a very good use, and it will benefit our sons and our daughters that are stationed in Germany. This is not a frivolous funding, and I would highly recommend that we vote against this amendment and support this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Furse amendment. At first blush, it might seem that a vote in favor of the amendment would be politically correct. After all, this project is not in anyone's district. There is not a single Member of this body who is going to be able to go home and brag about bringing home pork to his district. This expenditure simply provides for the needs of our servicemen who have signed on to support our national interests and have been assigned to Europe.

Also, we might get a plus from the Citizens Against Government Waste. And I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina. I am against government waste and I hate to receive a bad mark from a public interest group such as Citizens Against Government Waste. But if we pass the Furse amendment, we will do so at the expense of the quality of life of our servicemen who have agreed to serve our country and who are in desperate need of improved barracks right now.

Now, one thing that needs to be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, is that this project has been recommended by the U.S. Army. The subcommittee asked for a list of priorities, and the Army told us that these barracks were priorities. So let's make sure that we get that straight. The point has been made that they are not in the long-range plan. The question becomes why are they not in the long-range plan and why is this not in DOD's budget. As the gentleman from Hawaii pointed out earlier, the administrations have historically depended upon this Congress to take care of quality-of-life needs. They know that we are going to do right by our troops and that we will have to add certain funds if we are going to take care of our troops, particularly these single enlisted troops who depend on these barracks in Germany. So, I would urge that we defeat the Furse amendment that we take this little step toward quality of life for our troops.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, just to respond to a few of the comments that have been made, they talk about why do the Germans not do more. We are talking about \$5 million that they are willing to put into these projects. Now that is burden sharing.

One of the speakers mentioned, well, they can rent apartments for \$700 a month. How many enlisted people that these are going to benefit, the lower ranked enlisted people, can afford \$700 a month to live on the economy? That

might be nice, but who can afford that kind of thing? Yes, there are many projects we could do in America, and we are doing many projects across this country to try to improve quality of life across the country. But realize these are Americans that are in Bosnia now, and their permanent duty station is Germany. So when they come out of Bosnia, they go back to Germany. What kind of living conditions do we want them go come back to when they come back to Germany?

Mr. Chairman, as for it not being in the budget plan, as has been indicated by the previous speaker, it was a priority. When we asked the military about the priority, this was one of their priorities. As for the \$900 million over the President's request, that is making the assumption that the President was correct with his request.

Many of us do not think that he was correct, that he cuts too deep and he cuts too fast and particularly when we are talking about quality-of-life projects. Why was it not in the long-range plans? Well, one of the reasons I think it was not in the long-range plan, it is going to be in the next long-range plan as a matter of fact. One reason it was not in the long-range plans is we had the base closure procedure and we were taking out bases all over Europe that we had, some 400 facilities at one time or another, if I remember the figure correctly, and we did not know exactly where we would be.

We know now where we will be. We know what the needs are, and we need to get about meeting those needs.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the balance of my time, I would simply point out that, even though this bill is \$900 million more than the President's request, it does represent a budget savings and a substantial savings of 10 percent over the amount appropriated by this Congress last year.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no Member on the floor for whom I have greater affection or more respect than the gentlewoman from Oregon. She does an outstanding job for her State, for her constituents, and she does an outstanding job for this country. However, on this issue I disagree with her and would urge my colleagues to support the committee's judgment in this instance.

The reason for that is I have had the opportunity, as many Members have had, to visit housing overseas, in Germany and in other countries; and I know the condition of that housing. As I call him, the chairman in exile mentioned the fact that this was built in 1940. I was not 10 at that point in time, but I was around, albeit briefly. I understand that we need to make sure, as the gentleman from Colorado said, that when these troops return from Bosnia to their permanent duty station that they have housing which will in fact be quality-of-life housing.

Mr. Chairman, this committee in particular, as well as the authorizing com-

mittee, has worked very, very hard on quality-of-life issues. As a matter of fact, as I think the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned, in fact the Congress has been at the forefront. Not the administration, neither this one nor previous administrations, has been in the forefront of ensuring quality of life for our troops. So I want to commend the committee for including this sum, notwithstanding the fact that it may not have been on the list.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one who believes simply because an administration, whether it has been the Reagan or Bush or Clinton administration, failed to include something that it thereby is not something that is a priority item. So I commend the committee, urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support this expenditure for this very necessary housing for our troops.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Furse amendment.

I ask the sponsor of this amendment if she has ever visited the troops in Germany? Has she walked through one of these barracks built and paid for by the Germans during the 1930s? As chairman of this subcommittee I take pride that I have taken the time to visit with these troops, to talk to them and to see where they live. Many of them are on their first assignment and find themselves a long way from home and they do miss the amenities of the United States.

Let me share with you the condition I have found these barracks to be—76 percent of the U.S. Army's barracks in Europe still have gang latrines—when you walk into the buildings, obnoxious odors greet you because the plumbing systems are inadequately vented and emit sewer gases into the latrines and hallways. The gang latrines are under-sized, crowded, covered in moisture, rot, and mold growth and do not provide even a minimum amount of privacy for our soldiers.

The concrete and plaster interior surfaces are cracked and water-logged in areas next to these latrines. Paint is peeling, replacement tiles are not available so surfaces appear as an unmatched mosaic. Stairway nosings are broken, trends are worn and uneven. Heat and air conditioning systems continuously fail. Electrical service cannot handle the number of appliances—minor comforts such as a boom box—that the modern soldier possesses.

I remind my colleagues that these are volunteers and are very proud to be serving their country. And when I have asked them what is important to them, the answer I continuously hear is a decent place to live, a place to take a private shower, to have heat and air conditioning, and enough electricity to run a microwave.

We have far too long allowed the condition of these barracks to send the signal that we don't care. As chairman of this subcommittee, I have worked to

correct this unfortunate misconception—these barracks aren't in anyone's congressional district—they don't benefit one Member of this Congress—they benefit the young men and women who are deployed by President Clinton to Bosnia—as chairman of this subcommittee, and as I leave this House later this year, one of the things I am most proud of, is not just to talk about how I support our troops but to send a concrete signal that we really do care. I urge a strong vote against this amendment, and in support of the quality of life for our soldiers stationed overseas. There is nothing more important than to ensure they receive a decent place to live.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill would not be the fine product that it is without the able, dedicated, and professional work of our subcommittee staff, Liz Dawson, Hank Moore, Mary Arnold and Mark Murray, and I want to personally thank them for all their efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 289, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 200]

AYES—121

Barcia	Gillmor	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Green (TX)	Owens
Barton	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Bass	Hamilton	Pelosi
Becerra	Hancock	Peterson (MN)
Beilenson	Hastings (FL)	Petri
Berman	Hinchee	Poshard
Bilbray	Jackson (IL)	Ramstad
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Brown (CA)	(TX)	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Johnston	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (MA)	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Klecza	Roukema
Campbell	Klug	Royce
Cardin	Lantos	Rush
Chabot	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Clay	LoBiondo	Sanford
Coburn	Lofgren	Schroeder
Collins (MI)	Lowey	Schumer
Conyers	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Cooley	Maloney	Shays
Cummings	Markey	Slaughter
Danner	Martini	Smith (MI)
DeFazio	McCarthy	Spratt
Dellums	McDermott	Stark
Deutsch	McInnis	Stockman
Dingell	McKinney	Stokes
Doggett	Meehan	Studds
Duncan	Metcalf	Stupak
Durbin	Millender-	Towns
Ehlers	McDonald	Upton
Engel	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
English	Minge	Vento
Eshoo	Mink	Ward
Evans	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Fawell	Myrick	Weller
Filner	Nadler	Williams
Fox	Neal	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Neumann	Wynn
Franks (NJ)	Ney	Yates
Furse	Nussle	Zimmer

NOES—289

Abercrombie Funderburk Moran
 Ackerman Gallegly Morella
 Allard Ganske Murtha
 Andrews Gejdenson Myers
 Archer Gekas Nethercutt
 Arney Gephardt Norwood
 Baesler Gibbons Oberstar
 Baker (CA) Gilchrest Obey
 Baker (LA) Gilman Ortiz
 Baldacci Gonzalez Orton
 Ballenger Goodlatte Oxley
 Barr Goodling Packard
 Barrett (NE) Gordon Pallone
 Bartlett Goss Parker
 Bateman Graham Pastor
 Bentsen Greene (UT) Payne (VA)
 Bereuter Greenwood Pickett
 Bevil Bilirakis Gunderson Pombo
 Bishop Hall (OH) Porter
 Bliley Hall (TX) Portman
 Blute Hansen Pryce
 Boehlert Harman Quillen
 Boehner Hastert Radanovich
 Bonilla Rahall
 Bonior Hayworth Reed
 Bono Hefley Regula
 Borski Hefner Richardson
 Boucher Heineman Riggs
 Brewster Herger Roberts
 Browder Hillery Rogers
 Brown (FL) Hilliard Ros-Lehtinen
 Brownback Hobson Rose
 Bryant (TN) Hoekstra Roth
 Bunning Hoke Roybal-Allard
 Burr Holden Sabo
 Burton Horn Salmon
 Buyer Hostettler Sawyer
 Callahan Hoyer Saxton
 Calvert Hunter Scarborough
 Canady Hutchinson Schaefer
 Castle Hyde Schiff
 Chambliss Inglis Scott
 Chenoweth Istook Seastrand
 Christensen Jacobs Serrano
 Chrysler Johnson (CT) Shadegg
 Clayton Johnson (SD) Shaw
 Clement Johnson, E.B. Shuster
 Clinger Johnson, Sam Sisisky
 Clyburn Jones Skaggs
 Coble Kanjorski Skelton
 Coleman Kaptur Smith (NJ)
 Collins (GA) Kasich Smith (TX)
 Collins (IL) Kelly Smith (WA)
 Combest Kennedy (RI) Solomon
 Condit Kildee Souder
 Costello King Spence
 Cox Kingston Stearns
 Coyne Klink Stenholm
 Cramer Knollenberg Stump
 Crane Tanner Talent
 Crapo LaFalce Tate
 Cremeans LaHood Tauzin
 Cubin Largent Taylor (MS)
 Cunningham Latham Taylor (NC)
 Davis LaTourette Tejeda
 Deal Laughlin Thomas
 DeLauro Lazio Thompson
 DeLay Leach Thornberry
 Diaz-Balart Levin Thurman
 Dickey Lewis (CA) Tiahrt
 Dicks Lewis (KY) Torkildsen
 Dixon Lightfoot Torres
 Dooley Linder Torricelli
 Doolittle Lipinski Traficant
 Dornan Livingston Visclosky
 Doyle Longley Volkmer
 Dreier Lucas Vucanovich
 Dunn Manton Walker
 Edwards Manzullo Walsh
 Ehrlich Martinez Wamp
 Emerson Mascara Waters
 Ensign Matsui Watts (OK)
 Everett McCollum Waxman
 Ewing McCreery Weldon (FL)
 Farr McHale Weldon (PA)
 Fazio McHugh White
 Fields (TX) McIntosh Whitfield
 Flake McKeon Wicker
 Flanagan McNulty Wise
 Foley Meek Wolf
 Forbes Menendez Young (AK)
 Fowler Meyers Young (FL)
 Franks (CT) Mica Zeliff
 Frelinghuysen Miller (FL)
 Frisa Montgomery
 Frost Moorhead

NOT VOTING—24

Bachus Geren Molinari
 Camp Gutknecht Mollohan
 Chapman Hayes Paxon
 de la Garza Houghton Peterson (FL)
 Fattah Jefferson Pomeroy
 Fields (LA) Kennelly Quinn
 Foglietta Lincoln Thornton
 Ford McDade Wilson

□ 1300

Messrs. BLUTE, COSTELLO, OBERSTAR, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CHABOT, OLVER, FOX of Pennsylvania, and Ms. RIVERS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1997".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, 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. 3517), making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 442, 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 CHAIRMAN. 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 369, nays 43, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—369

Abercrombie Bevil Bunning
 Ackerman Bilbray Burr
 Allard Bilirakis Burton
 Andrews Bishop Buyer
 Archer Bliley Callahan
 Arney Blumenauer Calvert
 Baesler Blute Canady
 Baker (CA) Boehlert Cardin
 Baker (LA) Boehner Chastot
 Baldacci Bonilla Chabot
 Ballenger Bonior Chambliss
 Barcia Bono Chenoweth
 Barr Borski Christensen
 Barrett (NE) Boucher Chrysler
 Bartlett Brewster Clayton
 Barton Browder Clement
 Bass Brown (CA) Clinger
 Bateman Brown (FL) Clyburn
 Bentsen Brownback Coble
 Bereuter Bryant (TN) Coburn
 Berman Bunn Coleman

Collins (GA) Hillery Packard
 Collins (IL) Hilliard Pallone
 Collins (MI) Hinchey Parker
 Combest Hobson Pastor
 Condit Hoekstra Payne (NJ)
 Costello Hoke Payne (VA)
 Cox Holden Pelosi
 Coyne Horn Peterson (MN)
 Cramer Hostettler Pickett
 Crane Hoyer Pombo
 Crapo Hunter Pomeroy
 Cremeans Hutchinson Porter
 Cubin Hyde Portman
 Cummings Inglis Poshard
 Cunningham Istook Pryce
 Danner Jackson (IL) Quillen
 Davis Jackson-Lee Radanovich
 Deal (TX) Reed
 DeFazio Jacobs Regula
 DeLauro Johnson (CT) Richardson
 DeLay Johnson (SD) Riggs
 Dellums Johnson, E.B. Rivers
 Deutsch Johnson, Sam Roberts
 Diaz-Balart Jones Rogers
 Dickey Kanjorski Rohrabacher
 Dicks Kaptur Ros-Lehtinen
 Dingell Kasich Rose
 Dixon Kelly Roth
 Doggett Kennedy (MA) Roukema
 Dooley Kennedy (RI) Roybal-Allard
 Doolittle Kildee Rush
 Dornan Kim Sabo
 Doyle King Salmon
 Dreier Kingston Sanders
 Duncan Klink Sanford
 Dunn Knollenberg Sawyer
 Durbin Kolbe Saxton
 Edwards LaFalce Scarborough
 Ehlers Lantos Schaefer
 Ehrlich Largent Schiff
 Emerson Latham Schroeder
 Engel LaTourette Schumer
 English Laughlin Scott
 Ensign Lazio Seastrand
 Eshoo Leach Serrano
 Evans Levin Shadegg
 Everett Lewis (CA) Shaw
 Ewing Lewis (KY) Shays
 Farr Lightfoot Shuster
 Fawell Linder Sisisky
 Fazio Lipinski Skaggs
 Fields (TX) Livingston Skeen
 Filner LoBiondo Skelton
 Flake Longley Slaughter
 Flanagan Lowey Smith (MI)
 Foley Lucas Smith (NJ)
 Forbes Maloney Smith (TX)
 Fowler Manton Smith (WA)
 Fox Manzullo Solomon
 Franks (CT) Martinez Souder
 Franks (NJ) Mascara Spence
 Frelinghuysen McCarthy Spratt
 Frisa McCollum Stearns
 Frost McCreery Stenholm
 Funderburk McHale Stokes
 Gallegly McHugh Studds
 Ganske Gekas McInnis Stump
 Gejdenson McIntosh Stupak
 Gekas McKeon Talent
 Gephardt McNulty Tanner
 Geren Meehan Tate
 Gibbons Meek Tauzin
 Gilchrest Menendez Taylor (MS)
 Gillmor Metcalf Taylor (NC)
 Gilman Meyers Tejada
 Gonzalez Mica Thomas
 Goodlatte Millender-Thompson
 Goodling McDonald Thornberry
 Gordon Miller (CA) Thornton
 Goss Miller (FL) Thurman
 Graham Mink Tiahrt
 Green (TX) Moakley Torkildsen
 Greene (UT) Montgomery Torres
 Greenwood Moorhead Torricelli
 Gunderson Moran Towns
 Gutierrez Morella Traficant
 Hall (OH) Murtha Velazquez
 Hall (TX) Myers Visclosky
 Hamilton Myrick Volkmer
 Hansen Neal Vucanovich
 Harman Nethercutt Walker
 Hastert Ney Walsh
 Hastings (FL) Norwood Wamp
 Hastings (WA) Nussle Ward
 Hayworth Obey Waters
 Hefley Olver Watts (OK)
 Hefner Ortiz Waxman
 Heineman Orton Weldon (FL)
 Hergner Hoyer Oxley Weldon (PA)

White	Wolf	Young (FL)
Whitfield	Wolsey	Zeliff
Wicker	Wynn	Zimmer
Wise	Young (AK)	

NAYS—43

Barrett (WI)	Lewis (GA)	Ramstad
Becerra	Lofgren	Rangel
Beilenson	Luther	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Markey	Royce
Camp	Martini	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Matsui	Stark
Conyers	McDermott	Stockman
Cooley	McKinney	Upton
Frank (MA)	Minge	Vento
Furse	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Hancock	Neumann	Weller
Johnston	Oberstar	Williams
Klecza	Owens	Yates
Klug	Petri	
LaHood	Rahall	

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus	Ford	Molinari
Brown (OH)	Gutknecht	Mollohan
Chapman	Hayes	Paxon
Clay	Houghton	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Jefferson	Quinn
Fattah	Kennelly	Wilson
Fields (LA)	Lincoln	
Foglietta	McDade	

□ 1322

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS AND POSTPONING VOTES ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3322, OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3322, pursuant to House Resolution 427, it shall be in order to consider the following amendments, or germane modifications thereof, in sequence: The amendment numbered 15 printed by Representative LOFGREN; the amendment numbered 6 printed by Representative KENNEDY of Massachusetts; and the amendment numbered 5 printed by Representative JACKSON-LEE; 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 of those amendments or any amendments thereto; and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole 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 be not less than 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the material covered in the debate on H.R. 3322 yesterday.

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

There was no objection.

OMNIBUS CIVILIAN SCIENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 427 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3322.

□ 1325

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3322) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for civilian science activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. BURTON of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Wednesday, May 29, 1996, title II was open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to title II?

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

Mr. Chairman, before we started the debate today, I thought it would be useful maybe to explain the reason for the debate sequence and the way it took place yesterday on the Democrat substitute. Our side simply decided that it was appropriate to allow the Democrats to present, in any way they wished to do and as broad as they wished to present it, their substitute to our bill.

We think that our legislative product stands on its own, that it is a good science bill, it is good for the environment, it is a good long-term bill. The Democrats were obviously proud of their work. We have them the opportunity to fully describe that work before going to a vote, and we thought that was the right way to accommodate the debate in the House.

I do regret that in the course of that debate there were a couple of inaccuracies particularly represented by the gentleman from Texas when he referred to the work of the committee. At one point he referred to the work of the committee as only producing one report last year. I do wish to get that corrected be in the RECORD, and I will submit for be the RECORD a list of 16 reports filed by this committee over the year last year that indicates that this committee was working.

I do think that there is a need to produce quality rather than quantity as the mark of a legislative committee, and that is what we have been doing both legislatively and in terms of the

oversight hearings that we have been conducting. I just want to make certain that any inaccuracies that were stated during that time are in fact corrected, but I hope that we did see that there is a contrast of views when the Democrats present their side and we present our side.

Now we will proceed ahead with the bill and we will go through the amendment process here, and I hope that that amendment process will in fact produce the result of a bill that can be supported on a bipartisan basis on both sides of the aisle.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: Page 26, line 12, strike "\$2,167,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,107,400,000".

Page 30, line 11, strike "\$1,957,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,017,850,000, of which \$1,594,550,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, \$35,000,000 shall be for travel, and \$388,300,000 shall be for research operations support".

MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF FLORIDA

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be replaced with a new amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mr. WELDON of Florida: Page 26, line 12, strike "\$2,167,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,107,400,000".

Page 28, line 2, strike "\$410,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$405,600,000".

Page 28, line 3, strike "\$95,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,500,000".

Page 28, line 11, strike "\$281,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$276,250,000".

Page 30, line 11, strike "\$1,957,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,030,800,000, of which \$1,611,000,000 shall be for personnel and related costs, \$31,500,000 shall be for travel, and \$388,300,000 shall be for research operations support".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON]?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have not had an opportunity to review this amendment, and we are looking to determine the offset that has been represented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] at this time.

Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] to explain his particular amendment.

□ 1330

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, I believe the gentlewoman will agree my amendment is a good amendment.

The bill on the floor of the House has a shortfall for NASA personnel funding. The gentleman from Pennsylvania,