Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NOES—155

Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rivers
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Scott
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson
Thurman
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman
Baker (LA)
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Collins (IL)
Coyne
Dickey
Dooley
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Flake
Gallegly
Gephardt
Hayes
Jefferson
Kleczka
Largent
Lewis (CA)
Maloney
Matsui
Mineta
Moakley
Pelosi
Royce
Schumer
Smith (NJ)
Stokes
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Tucker
Waters
Yates

□ 1135

Mr. HALL of Ohio changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable absence, today I missed rollcall vote No. 386, ordering the previous question, and rollcall vote No. 387, on House Resolution 167. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on each of those rollcall votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 167 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1817.

□ 1136

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman and inform the membership that not only is this bill historic, but, in fact, the moment we are about to experience here with the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chair of the Subcommittee on Military Construction handling this bill, is a truly historic moment for women and for men in our country, because, in fact, as she moves this bill today, this will only be the second time in the 200-year history of our country that a woman has chaired any of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, which is an exclusive committee.

The last such woman to handle such a bill was Julia Butler Hansen of Washington State who, at the age of 67, retired from this institution and chaired the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies at the end of her career.

I just want to congratulate the gentlewoman. The road here is still a difficult one for women and to rise and chair one of the most exclusive subcommittees is truly an honor. We are proud of you. Good luck with the bill and congratulations to the people of Nevada for sending you here.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewomen for those remarks. All we need to do now is get along with this and get this done.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present to the House the recommendations for the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. The funding contained in this bill reflects only 4 percent of the total defense authorization passed by the House yesterday, totals $11.2 billion, and is within the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. This represents a $500 million increase over the President's request and a $2.5 billion increase over fiscal year 1995.

Only recently has public attention been given to the problems our subcommittee has been citing for several years: the quality and deficit of military family housing for our military personnel, the necessity for support facilities for our service members and their families, and the importance of providing an adequate working environment to improve productivity and readiness. The committee has heard testimony from many different spectrums 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 appropriation and authorization committees have worked closely to provide for the number one priority of the military—quality of life for the men, women and their families, who voluntarily serve. Not one single project is included in this bill that was not included in the authorization bill which passed yesterday.

There is no question that there is a crisis in providing adequate housing. I cannot emphasize enough what an important role this plays in retention and readiness. This is the number one concern of our military personnel. Many barracks still contain gang latrines, suffer from inadequate heating and cooling, corroded pipes, electrical systems which fail and peeling lead-based paint. Continuous maintenance is required. Over 600,000 men and women are living in troop housing and about one half of the barracks were built 30 or more years ago, with an average age of 40 years. of this inventory, over one fourth are considered substandard, and the Department estimates it will take up to 40 years at a cost of $8.5 billion to correct these deficiencies.

The situation with family housing is not much better. Two-thirds of the 350,000 family housing units in DOD's inventory are over 30 years old and require a substantial annual investment

to meet maintenance requirements. Over the years, the majority of these homes have gone without adequate maintenance and repair and a current backlog in excess of $2 billion. This coupled with nearly 30 years and another $3 billion to eliminate the deteriorated and failing inventory pose a serious problem to the services. The committee recognizes that a combination of several different approaches will be necessary to help meet housing needs. A total of $4.3 billion, or 40 percent of this bill, is devoted to construction and operations and maintenance of the existing inventory. In addition, $22 million is included to fund Secretary Perry's top priority to begin the implementation of a pilot project to encourage private sector initiatives to help eliminate the family housing crisis. The challenge to help resolve this problem is for a sustained overall commitment, by Congress and the administration, at funding levels that will reduce the deficits and increase the quality of living conditions in a reasonable period of time.

This bill is not just about housing, it is also about necessary support facilities for our service members and their families—facilities that are growing more important with increased deployments; and, the importance of providing an adequate working environment to improve productivity and readiness. The bill provides needed facilities, worldwide, to support air, sea, and land operations for our forces; and, those facilities necessary to maintain a vast array of weapons and equipment. Twenty-five percent of this bill, or $2.8 billion, is devoted to military construction for these facilities. Also included under the military construction accounts is $636 million to address the substandard facilities our troops must live in; $207 million for environmental compliance; $179 million for medical related facilities; $108 million for chemical demilitarization and $57 million for child development centers.

In addition, a significant portion of this appropriation—35 percent or $3.9 billion, is to fund base realignment and closures. The implementation of base closures requires large upfront costs to ensure the eventual savings. Over 51 percent of the increase in this bill is applied toward the base closure accounts. This amount of funding will keep closures on schedule, includes $785 million for implementation of the 1995 round now under consideration, and devotes $457 million for environmental restoration at closed bases.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, 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 begins to address the military's priorities. I want to express my deep appreciation to Mr. HEFNER for his commitment to this bill. When he was chairman of this subcommittee, he worked hard to provide badly needed quality of life improvements and many other programs that contribute to the well-being of our forces. He did this at a time these programs were not in the press and of such a high priority. As the ranking member, he has continued this commitment—his cooperation and insights into the problems we confront have been invaluable.

Mr. Chairman, I realize we are asking our colleagues to vote for a substantial increase. I hope as we debate this bill today they keep in mind that we are only talking about 4 percent of the total defense budget. But this $11.2 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. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join us in support of this bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1817)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Military construction, Army	550,476,000	472,724,000	625,608,000	+75,132,000	+152,884,000
Military construction, Navy	385,110,000	488,086,000	588,243,000	+203,133,000	+100,157,000
Military construction, Air Force	516,813,000	495,555,000	578,841,000	+62,028,000	+83,186,000
Military construction, Defense-wide	504,118,000	857,405,000	728,332,000	+224,214,000	-129,073,000
Total, Active components	1,956,517,000	2,313,670,000	2,521,024,000	+564,507,000	+207,154,000
Military construction, Army National Guard	188,062,000	18,480,000	72,537,000	-115,525,000	+54,057,000
Military construction, Air National Guard	249,056,000	85,847,000	118,267,000	-130,789,000	+32,420,000
Military construction, Army Reserve	57,370,000	42,963,000	42,963,000	-14,407,000	.....
Military construction, Naval Reserve	22,748,000	7,920,000	19,655,000	-3,093,000	+11,735,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve	57,066,000	27,002,000	31,502,000	-25,564,000	+4,500,000
Total, Reserve components	574,302,000	182,012,000	284,924,000	-289,378,000	+102,912,000
Total, Military construction	2,530,819,000	2,495,682,000	2,805,948,000	+275,129,000	+310,066,000
NATO Security Investment Program	119,000,000	179,000,000	161,000,000	+42,000,000	-18,000,000
Family housing, Army:					
Construction	170,002,000	43,500,000	126,400,000	-43,602,000	+82,900,000
Operation and maintenance	1,013,708,000	1,337,596,000	1,337,596,000	+323,888,000	.....
Total, Family housing, Army	1,183,710,000	1,381,096,000	1,463,996,000	+280,286,000	+82,900,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps:					
Construction	267,465,000	465,755,000	531,289,000	+263,824,000	+65,534,000
Operation and maintenance	937,599,000	1,048,329,000	1,048,329,000	+110,730,000	.....
Total, Family housing, Navy	1,205,064,000	1,514,084,000	1,579,618,000	+374,554,000	+65,534,000
Family housing, Air Force:					
Construction	277,444,000	249,003,000	294,503,000	+17,059,000	+45,500,000
Operation and maintenance	824,845,000	849,213,000	863,213,000	+38,368,000	+14,000,000
Total, Family housing, Air Force	1,102,289,000	1,098,216,000	1,157,716,000	+55,427,000	+59,500,000
Family housing, Defense-wide:					
Construction	350,000	3,772,000	3,772,000	+3,422,000	.....
Operation and maintenance	29,031,000	30,467,000	30,467,000	+1,436,000	.....
Total, Family housing, Defense-wide	29,381,000	34,239,000	34,239,000	+4,858,000	.....
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund 1/	.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	+22,000,000	.....
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	.....	75,586,000	75,586,000	+75,586,000	.....
Total, Family housing	3,520,444,000	4,125,221,000	4,333,155,000	+812,711,000	+207,934,000
Construction	(715,261,000)	(762,030,000)	(955,964,000)	(+240,703,000)	(+193,934,000)
Operation and maintenance	(2,805,183,000)	(3,265,605,000)	(3,279,605,000)	(+474,422,000)	(+14,000,000)
Family Housing Improvement Fund	.....	(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(+22,000,000)	.....
Homeowners Assistance Fund	.....	(75,586,000)	(75,586,000)	(+75,586,000)	.....
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part I	87,600,000	.....	.....	-87,600,000	.....
Part II	265,700,000	964,843,000	964,843,000	+699,143,000	.....
(By transfer)	(133,000,000)	.....	.....	(-133,000,000)	.....
Part III	2,322,858,000	2,148,480,000	2,148,480,000	-174,378,000	.....
Part IV	.....	784,569,000	784,569,000	+784,569,000	.....
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts	2,676,158,000	3,897,892,000	3,897,892,000	+1,221,734,000	.....
Procurement: General provisions 2/	-10,421,000	.....	.....	+10,421,000	.....
FY 1995 Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 104-6)	-100,800,000	.....	.....	+100,800,000	.....
Grand total	8,735,400,000	10,697,995,000	11,197,995,000	+2,462,595,000	+500,000,000
Appropriations	(8,735,400,000)	(10,697,995,000)	(11,197,995,000)	(+2,462,595,000)	(+500,000,000)
(By transfer)	(133,000,000)	.....	.....	(-133,000,000)	.....

1/ Budget amendment submitted 6/2/95 (H.Doc. 104-80).
2/ Budget amendment submitted 3/15/94 (H.Doc. 103-220, page 10).

□ 1145

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for those kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in general, I want to rise in support of this bill, and, of course, to complement the recommendations made by Chairwoman VUCANOVICH and the way in which the bill was put together. As chairman of this subcommittee I have in the past emphasized providing adequate funding for quality of life projects. For years many people would pay lip service to the concept of addressing our family housing and barracks deficits. We on this subcommittee understand perhaps better than any other group of members, that providing our men and women in the military with a decent place to live and raise their families is the key to readiness and retention, and we are actually doing something about it in this bill.

I applaud the chairwomen's continuing of this theme as she developed the recommendations for fiscal year 1996. The quality of life projects included in this bill will reduce the deficit of adequate barracks and family housing spaces, and will provide additional child care capacity in many locations.

At Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base several vitally needed projects have been funded. In particular the folks at Fort Bragg will benefit from a vitally needed new health clinic. The current facility is a two-story World War II building with no handicapped access and conditions that make it impossible to maintain sanitary operations. In addition two badly needed barracks projects have been funded along with a staging area complex. This will increase the readiness of our vital forces stationed at Fort Bragg.

It is my understanding that the bill is $500 million above the President's request, and that this is based on the House budget resolution which added several billion to the President's request for Defense. The final number for Defense spending is pending before the Budget Committee's in their conference, and therefore the ability of the subcommittee to retain that $500 million in additional funds is in some doubt. While I understand the committee's action to spend these additional funds, we will find ourselves with some difficult choices later on in the process.

The bill recommends $11.2 billion in budget authority, and is consistent with the section 602(b) allocation. The bill contains most of the individual projects recommended in the authorization bill just passed by the House, and contains no unauthorized projects.

Of the funds added to the President's request $202 million are for barracks, $207 million is for family housing, $34 million is for child development centers, and $80 million is for medical programs and active component projects. Of the funds added to the bill 72 percent are for these quality of life items.

There may be some amendments to this bill which cuts all or a portion of these added projects. I will oppose those amendments. After all the years of rhetoric on improving living and working conditions in the military, its time to act and approve this funding.

Finally, I want to compliment Mrs. VUCANOVICH for the way in which this bill was put together. The needs of many Members from both sides of the aisle were taken into account in the formulation of the bill, and it reflects a bipartisan effort. I would highly recommend that members support the bill.

I would also like to congratulate the staff that has worked so hard and so diligently to put this bill together.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge support of this bill.

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

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. 1817, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

Just yesterday, the House passed H.R. 1530, the National Defense Authorization Act for the coming year. Three hundred Members supported this measure. The House should also give similar support to this bill.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I can assure the House that this bill squarely addresses one of the most serious problems confronting the Department of Defense and the people who serve in our Nation's military services. That problem is the quality and availability of adequate troop housing and military family housing.

There is no question that there is a crisis in military housing. Over 600,000 single enlisted personnel are assigned to on-base troop housing facilities. The average age of barracks and dormitories is over 40 years. One-fourth of these facilities is considered substandard.

The situation in family housing is not much better. Approximately 218,000—or two thirds—of the homes in the housing inventory of the Department of Defense are classified inadequate. One-quarter of the homes in the DOD inventory is over 40 years old and two-thirds are over 30 years old. This aging military family stock has extremely high maintenance and repair needs.

To put something tangible behind these dry statistics, I have here some examples of the problem we are trying to fix.

The first photo was taken at the U.S. Air Force Base in Incirlik, Turkey. This is military family housing. If anything this illustrates what we are trying to deal with here.

This is a picture of family housing for junior enlisted personnel at NAS Lemoore in California. These homes are about 40 years old and are structurally unsound.

This is family housing at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, IL.

It look like a country that has been controlled by communism for 40 years, does it not? The buildings are falling apart, the wires are exposed. Again, this is family housing for our people we ask to serve in the armed services.

If you are in the armed services, where would you like to be stationed? The garden spot? Would that be Hawaii? Would you like to go to Hawaii to serve if you are in the armed services? If you do, this may be the way that your family is required to live. This is housing in Hawaii.

Is there any doubt that the present military housing situation is unacceptable? The Secretary of Defense has recognized that; the authorizing committee has recognized it; and so does the Appropriations Committee. Together, we are determined to put us on a path toward fixing the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I just received a letter from the Secretary of Defense, Dr. William Perry. Let me just share this with the Members:

> In light of the House completion of its consideration of fiscal year 1996 DOD authorization bill and today's debate on the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Appropriations Act, let me again express my personal appreciation for the Members' support of your housing improvement initiative. Your leadership has been invaluable in moving this important program forward.
>
> Our effort to improve family housing is the cornerstone of our effort to enhance the quality of life of those men and women who serve so valiantly in our armed forces. Your actions and those of your Committee on Appropriations counterpart have given us the momentum we need to address the serious deficiencies that exist today.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of the session, Chairman VUCANOVICH and I agreed that improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families would be our top priority. We also agreed that there would be no—and I stress no—unauthorized appropriations in the military construction budget. Working with our colleagues on the two subcommittees, especially Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. HEFNER, the two ranking members, we settled on a series of tough criteria to judge proposed projects.

Even more importantly, we reached a joint agreement on Milcon for the coming year which we have recommended to the House. The authorization bill is the appropriations bill. The degree of coordination, cooperation, and bipartisan spirit with which we have approached our work is unprecedented since I have been in Congress. This has not been a business-as-usual process; and this is not a business-as-usual bill.

Working with the military services, we have identified a number of unfunded and badly needed quality of life improvements in housing, child care,

and health care facilities that can be executed next year. We have funded solely those projects where the need is the greatest and the dollars can immediately be put to use. We have agreed on a strong quality of life package, and I would encourage every Member of this body to support this package. It does a great deal for those we ask to defend our Nation.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I would like to also congratulate the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for her leadership in the presenting of this appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment regarding the appropriations of $14 million for an Army museum, or for land to buy, to purchase land that the Army museum will be built on. That is the issue here.

Let me tell the Members what this is not about. This is not about Democrat versus Republican. This is not about whether you are pro-defense or anti-defense. We have good people who are for this bill and for this museum.

□ 1200

There are some good people who are championing this. The question here is do we need to be spending taxpayer dollars for this purchase at this time?

There are several reasons why I think that we should oppose this purchase:

First, the Army already has 48 museums in the United States. I ask them in hearings, do you have any other museums? They tell me we have 48. But they want one here in the Washington, DC area so that they can have it in the monument corridor. I don't think we need a 49th museum at this price to the taxpayer.

Second, in effect we are doing this spending for a museum that does not contribute to national security, and we are doing it with money that we do not have, since we are running the deficit deeper for this purpose.

Third, in a time of budgetary restraint, it is unreasonable to make this expenditure of public funds when private donations sufficient to cover the purchase are apparently available and are a more appropriate source of funding.

It has been said that this is not going to cost the taxpayer dollars because it is going to come from private donations. I imagine that is going to be a tax-exempt private entity that is going to be doing this, so the taxpayers are going to be underwriting it. Plus, the taxpayers are being asked to spend $14 million to buy the land. I ask, the $70 million that they are going to raise privately to pay for the museum, why can we not use that money to buy the land?

Next, should the Army, in fact, be unable to raise these private contributions required to build the museum, then the Government would simply be adding more land to its inventory without any benefit to the public.

The question of whether this land is going to be available: We have got to buy it now or we will lose it. It has been sitting out there since 1987. The same companies have owned it.

CBO estimates that my amendment saves $14 million in budget authority and $2.2 million in outlays.

I would like to close, Mr. Chairman, by reading one paragraph from a letter from the Citizens Against Government Waste. This letter is just issued today, the Citizens Against Government Waste. They say:

> Finally, in the case of the land acquisition for yet another Army museum, we move to an unusual military theater of operations, the theater of the absurd. This will be Army museum number 49. How many museums do we really need while we're going another $180 billion in debt next year?

''Moreover,''—Mr. Chairman, I wish we would pay attention to this, this is the Citizens Against Government Waste—''we believe there are questions of impropriety in a building site buyout that looks likes a bailout of a major corporation with taxpayer dollars.'' I hope that the Members of this body will pay attention to this.

If we need a new museum, it should be paid for by private funds, and not now when we are telling the taxpayers we have got to dig deeper, and we are telling the men and women in the military that we can't help them with the readiness any more or with housing any more, but we can do this. I think we should stop talking to the generals and start talking to the men and women in our military, and start talking to the American taxpayer.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Nevada, distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee Appropriations, yield for a colloquy?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman for her efforts in the military construction appropriations bill to put forth a military construction program that will increase the quality of life for our military troops as well as revitalize our national security posture.

I would like to reiterate the concerns I have already expressed about the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Center in my district in Pasadena, CA, which is the home of the 4th Low Altitude Air Defense Battalion, a frontline unit, several units of which were mobilized in Desert Storm. Here is a perfect example for a center which is run down, old, and probably unsafe.

In my discussions with the Marine Corps, they have expressed a desire to stay in Pasadena if we could demonstrate to them that we could solve their concern about inadequate and dilapidated facilities. The city of Pasadena is willing to forgo the rent that has been paid in order to keep the center where it is. What is needed is approximately $6 million to renovate the center. This is a primary example of what can be done in a cost-effective manner to revitalize existing military facilities.

Do you believe it is possible that this project may at some point in the future be included in some way as part of the military construction appropriation? I intend to continue to work with the authorizing committee of both Houses, and I hope we will be able to work together to ensure that projects such as this are included in the construction improvements put forth in fiscal year 1996 by this legislation.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. I would like to assure the gentleman that we understand his concern and will continue to look into this matter. If the gentleman will keep us informed of his efforts with the authorizing committee, we will work together to try and find a solution.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], vice chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] as well as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] for the professionalism they have displayed in handling this bill.

The gentlewoman from Nevada has taken members of her subcommittee all over the country and all over the world looking at the terrible conditions our military people are living in. The trips she took us on were not pleasurable trips because we had to face the families of American servicemen who live in these squalid conditions. We had to look at broken pipes, and electrical connections that were even dangerous.

It is ironic that this time last year when this bill was before the House, there was very little controversy. I do not think there is going to be a big controversy on the fact that we are trying to better the quality of life for the men and women who protect us in the military.

Ironically, last year the only debate we had on housing was whether or not to give the Russians over $150 million to build houses for their retired military officers. It is great that this year instead we are concentrating primarily on one of the most important things that this Congress can do, and that is to show the men and women who have come to us, and all the officers and all the people that represent the Government that have come to us and told us, ''We need to recognize this tremendous dilemma we are in and we need to do something about it.''

This bill does just that. It is a compliment to the ranking member and to our chairwoman and this brilliant staff she has assimilated in order to draft this legislation. Let me tell you, the Nation should be proud.

I know that every person in the military who is watching this program today is going to be appreciative of what we are doing for them and appreciative of the fact that the entire effort of this measure is to better their living conditions and to ensure they have a safe and a pleasurable place to live so they can do what they are supposed to be doing and not worrying about whether or not their family is safe at home or whether or not their roofs are leaking.

I compliment all of you today. I am proud to be a part of this subcommittee that has drafted this legislation. I know that my colleague from Alabama is concerned about minor parts of this bill, but let me tell all Members, this is a good bill just the way it is written and I think we ought to adopt it just the way it is written.

I thank the chairwoman for giving me the opportunity to express this, and thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for their compassionate understanding of the needs of these great men and women who serve us so well.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1817, and commend the chairwoman and the ranking member for their outstanding work.

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

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I support the military construction appropriations bill, and particularly its commitment to family housing improvements.

In this aspect, the bill dovetails perfectly with what we have already passed in the Defense authorization bill.

That should be no surprise, because members and staff of both committees have worked very closely on this. As a result, both bills fund family housing above current levels, as well as above the administration request.

All of us have been concerned about military family housing problems over the last few years.

This is a critical component of readiness and quality of life that has not always had sufficient attention.

As outlined in my committee's report, we believe there are critical shortfalls in both quality and quantity.

Modernization and new construction have not progressed at the pace necessary to maintain our normal high standards.

Another aspect of the issue is that the All-Volunteer Force creates different kinds of housing needs.

Our military is in transition. It is no longer primarily made up of single men living in the barracks.

We have far more servicemembers—men and women—who have families and children.

Their housing needs are obviously different from those of people who served in the military even a few short years ago.

We have an obligation to keep up with this transition by ensuring that the great people who serve in the military have quality housing.

These issues are so important that I ask you: Oppose any effort to reduce our commitments to better housing.

Our military people and their families deserve the best we have to offer.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the perspective of my friend, the gentleman from Alabama. In fact, if the information that he believes to be the case were true, I would agree with him that we ought not go forward and build a surplus museum that represents a corporate buyout, but that is hardly the case. It could not be further from the case, in fact.

The reality is that this is a one-time opportunity, once in our lifetimes, probably in the history of our capital area, where we have one last opportunity to purchase the last major site in what is called the monumental corridor.

There is one last site left. It is kitty-corner to the Jefferson Memorial. It is on the gateway into the Capital. It is on line with the Washington Monument and Jefferson Memorial, and the private corporation that owns it wants to build high-rise office buildings on it. That is where the money is, that is where the profit is. If we do not act right now, they will do just that.

Every time we drive into the Nation's Capital, we see these big corporate office buildings at the edge of the river just before we cross the Potomac River, we will know that that is the site where we should have the U.S. Army Museum.

We have to act now. We cannot wait to raise private funds. That is what the Army would prefer to do. They do not want to have to pay for this with public funds, even though the other services pay for their national museums with public funds, and every other Nation has an Army museum that they have paid for with public funds. We need public funds only for the site acquisition, because it has to be done immediately if we are to preserve this site. That is why we need it.

The Army is going to raise $72 million. We are not asking for the money to build the U.S. Army Museum. We are only asking for the money we need right now. In fact, it is less money than the administration requested and was authorized this past week in the national security authorization.

The money has been authorized. It is not going to any kind of pork project. We have to get it now. It is a small downpayment on what will serve this country into perpetuity.

Mr. Chairman, we have 48 museums around the country, I grant you that, but they are small museums, built for specific purposes. There is no national Army museum. In fact, the 20 million people that come to the Nation's Capital are going to realize the history of this country when they go to this Army museum, and all of us are going to be proud for the vote that we take today to protect this money, to make this small down payment.

There is no other way that we can show the 500,000 artifacts that have been created throughout our Nation's history, 220 years of collecting these priceless artifacts. We have got the Spanish American War uniforms, 19th century brick casements with 32-pounder guns. We have got a signal flag that was used at Little Round Top during the Battle of Gettysburg.

The purpose of this is to instill greater citizenship among the people who visit the Nation's Capital, and in fact to provide the Army with the kind of pride and esprit de corps that they deserve. All those families and relatives and friends of people who have served in the Army ought to have that opportunity when they come to the Nation's Capital, to see these priceless artifacts, to see the development of the United States Army, to recognize the importance we put on those people who have served this country.

In fact, we have more people who served in the United States Army than any of the other services, and none of the other services obviously are opposed to this. But we need to educate our citizens as well. People are losing a sense of history in this country. That is one of the reasons we are losing some of our civility, as well, as a society.

□ 1215

This museum will show our Nation what people sacrificed to bring us to where we are. And much of that sacrifice occurred within the ranks of the United States Army.

We have compelling reasons to keep this money in, and I would urge my colleagues to defeat the Browder amendment, to leave the small amount of money in.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a member of our subcommittee and president of the Republican freshman class.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the military construction appropriation bill, and I want to take special note of the fact that every single dollar contained in the bill is for authorized projects.

In addition, the budget resolution set a funding goal for this appropriation

and the bill meets that goal. I hasten to add that this appropriation bill is part of an overall spending plan that gives us a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The bill provides funding for military housing, airfield construction, infrastructure, for NATO, and base realignment and closure.

Our bill provides $4.3 billion for family housing, an area where, sadly, Congress has proven to be far shortsighted over the past few years. We intend to make up for that oversight today.

The men and women to serve in our Armed Forces, Mr. Chairman, have truly earned the right to a decent place to sleep and eat and their husbands, wives, and children who are left behind when they are called away at a moment's notice also have earned the right to expect better treatment from their Government.

Further, it is true that our appropriation exceeds President Clinton's request by $208 billion. Mr. Chairman, we do not have to be ashamed that we are demonstrating a greater commitment than the President has to the quality of life of those who serve in our Armed Forces. The committee simply put a higher priority on military quality of life than the President did. That is nothing to back down from.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say this is a good bill. We have based it on sound principles. And I remind my colleagues again that every single dollar appropriated has been authorized. The committee has prioritized the needs of our Defense Department and those who serve in uniform and their families. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and urge my colleagues to vote aye on final passage.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, we are in a situation here in the summer of 1995 where we are attempting to figure out how will we balance the budget. We had the fortunate occurrence earlier this week with the President making a commitment to join with Congress to balance the budget in a time certain.

This exercise is not going to be easy. It is going to require sacrifice in all areas of the country, in all activities that the Federal Government sponsors. And if we do not truly have shared sacrifice, we sap, we undermine, the willingness, the ability of others in this great Nation to join in this deficit-reduction budget-balancing effort.

This is the first of several appropriations bills to come before the U.S. House of Representatives. The question I submit is not really can we justify, one way or another, individual projects in this bill which are being identified for elimination. To be sure, we can.

All of us like museums. All of us like to welcome guests to our Nation's Capital and point out the fine features. All of us want to support our men and women in the Armed Forces.

All of us want to make sure that we have bases that are the best equipped in the world. But we cannot afford to do everything that each of us would like to do. The question is where do we draw the line? How do we draw the line? And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we need to draw the line in consultation with the President and using common sense.

Is a museum something that we can afford when we are trying to balance the budget? If that museum is on a site owned by the private sector and that site has been valued at just over $10 million by the assessor in Virginia, why are we prepared to pay $14 million to the private landowner?

If we have housing facilities that are costing more than $200,000 a unit, let us ask: Is there not a way that we can do this better?

If we have facilities that are being built at bases and these facilities have not been requested by the Defense Department and by the administration, why do we need to do them this year? These are examples of things that are in this bill that we need to eliminate.

We need to send a message, not only to those men and women in this body that are composing the appropriations bills, but to the rest of the Nation, that balancing the budget is a top priority.

We cannot afford to increase by 28 percent military construction from 1994 to 1995, we cannot afford to increase by $500 million military construction in this bill over and above what the Defense Department and the White House has requested.

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. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the military construction appropriations bill.

This bill mirrors the authorization bill we passed yesterday, providing a much-needed boost to our military's quality of life.

For years, one administration after another has scrimped on the quality of life of our troops to pay for other priorities. In addition, we have been investing large sums in recent military construction bills to accommodate the base closure process. In fact, some 35 percent of this bill goes to base closure. While base closure investments will enable military consolidations that will reap significant dividends down the road, they also have had the effect of further squeezing our military personnel. The shortchanging of these personnel is finally coming home to roost.

Today, 60 percent of our military personnel are married, versus 40 percent only 20 years ago. Quality of life issues matter more and more. When coupled with the strains of extended deployments and uncertainties about military careers, substandard housing and other deficiencies mean that too many of our most talented military personnel are voting with their feet and leaving the military. We must act if we want to ensure that our fighting forces remain the best and the brightest.

Today we have an opportunity to do that. The bill before us includes a desperately needed $4.3 billion for military family housing. This funding is intended to help address the severe shortage of adequate military housing that exists today—a shortage that affects some 300,000 military families.

In my district, Naval Station Mayport has not seen an investment in new or renovated housing for 11 years. Some 1,300 military families—roughly 8,000 military personnel and their dependents—are waiting for base housing that is not available.

As one chief petty officer at Mayport recently said about living on-base, ''when I'm gone for six months straight, the base is its own little community, totally self-sufficient with everything my family needs, and an excellent security force. There is . . . a support system for my family while I'm gone.''

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will not continue to shortchange our military personnel and their loved ones today by opposing this legislation. I urge their support for this bill.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I first would like to speak out in strong support of this legislation. As someone who represents 45,000 Army soldiers, I want to say thank you to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member, for having made a commitment to provide the quality of life for our military families that they so greatly deserve.

I would also like to speak out against the Browder amendment, which would strike the funding for any Army Museum.

I sometimes vote with Citizens Against Government Waste; I oftentimes vote with that organization. But I take offense that they would call the proposed National Army Museum a theater of the absurd. For any organization to call a museum that would be a tribute to the hundreds of thousands of men and women who served our Nation and been willing to put their lives on the line for our freedoms, for them to call such a tribute to those men and women that is absolutely unfair and unconscionable.

What is a museum? I think a museum is an education tool. In the case of the Army Museum, it could be a retention tool. It could be a source of pride for every young man or woman serving in the U.S. Army today or any person who has ever served in the U.S. Army.

Now, people can poke fun at museums and make them sound like pork-barrel projects. I want to tell the Members, of all the experiences I have had in Washington, DC, perhaps none has been more meaningful to me personally than the 3½ hours I spent one day with my wife in the Holocaust Museum, for

it was through that experience that a citizen of this country, born after the end of World War II, learned firsthand of the horror of World War II and the horror of tyranny at its worst at the hands of Adolf Hitler.

The Holocaust Museum did not glorify war and it did not glorify the Holocaust. Rather, it showed me and the thousands of schoolchildren who have visited since that our Nation must do everything possible to see that something like that tragedy never occurs again in the history of this world.

I believe an Army Museum can serve the same purpose. Such a museum would not glorify war, it would glorify those who sacrificed their full measure of devotion to see their country can have the opportunities and the freedoms that you and I enjoy today.

Such an Army Museum would also educate millions of young schoolchildren, 4 million of whom come to this Nation's Capital each and every year, and education those children that our Nation must do everything possible to see that we prevent war, that war, in fact, is not a glorius thing as sometimes it is shown to be on television, but war is a devastating experience to all those involved with it and all those affected by it.

So, Mr. Chairman and Members, I urge support not only for this legislation, but I would request your vote against the Browder amendment. Our Nation and our Army soldiers deserve a National Army Museum.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1817, the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Appropriations Act. This bill represents a reasoned approach toward addressing the shortage of quality housing within the Department of Defense. It also works to ensure the quality of life for the men and women who serve in the military. Approximately two-thirds of the family housing units in the Department's inventory are over 30 years old and require extensive maintenance. Furthermore, roughly one-half of all military barracks are also over 30 years old, with an average age of nearly 40 years. We should not expect the brave men and women in our Armed Forces to live in these conditions.

However, there is another compelling reason to support this bill. Recognizing the pressing needs of single military parents, dual military couples, and military personnel with civilian employed spouses, the Military Construction Subcommittee more than doubled the funding for child development centers. This is a significant step toward meeting the Defense Department's established goal of providing quality child care.

Nowhere is this pressing need more visible than at the U.S. Military Academy, which is located in the district I represent. H.R. 1817 provides funding for a single story, standard design child development center to provide child care for over 300 children. Although there is a lengthy waiting list, the current facilities at West Point accommodate just over one-half that amount.

The present child development center is a 3-floor warehouse constructed in 1885, 100 years ago. The part-day preschool is located in a World War II-era wood building. Both facilities have structural problems that are simply to uneconomical to repair. Clearly, those working to prepare the U.S. Army's future leaders deserve the peace of mind of knowing that their children are receiving quality child care, in decent facilities.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1817 provides vital funding to improve the child development center problem at West Point and numerous other military facilities throughout the Nation. It also addresses the housing crisis throughout the Department of Defense in a reasonable, fiscally responsible manner. All of the projects in the bill have been authorized and the total appropriation is consistent with the budget resolution that this Chamber passed. Without the funding provided by this bill, we run the risk of eroding the readiness and morale of our troops. We cannot allow that to happen. I urge my colleagues to support the bill. Our service men and women deserve nothing less.

□ 1230

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], who is a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment our new chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee for the outstanding job that she has done in this new responsibility. She has been a long-time member of this subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking Democrat.

For many years, I served on the Military Construction Subcommittee and we had cut to a minimum, and I think cut too deeply, into the funding for military construction and for quality of life, and if we are talking about the readiness and the training of our people, you have got to have the physical facility on these defense bases. You have got to have housing. You have got to have the educational and training facilities. You have got to have physical training facilities. These things all are important to the sailors, to the Army, the Marine Corps people, and the bottom line here is you can make some very big mistakes by cutting back on these kinds of things, these quality-of-life items.

What happens is the people then bolt, and they leave the services, and you have a major retention problem.

I can remember Admiral Hayworth coming up in 1979 to the defense subcommittee, which I have been a member of for 17 years. He says, ''I am here to talk about what we have got to do to keep people in the services, and if we continue to let these facilities get worse and we do not deal with these problems in housing, physical training, all of these things that are important to the modern-era sailor and the modern-era person in the military, then they leave the services.''

So I urge today that we support this bill, that we oppose the amendments that are aimed at taking out housing and training facilities, foundry at Philadelphia, so essential to maintaining some ability in the Government sector to producing propellers that is crucial to doing that important kind of work.

Let us support the committee and vote down these ill-considered amendments.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], a member of the Committee on National Security.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the 1996 military construction appropriations bill. I want to commend both Chairwoman VUCANOVICH and Chairman HEFLEY for their fine work.

In particular, I want to commend the two chairs for their initiative in addressing what we all agree is a tremendous problem, the widespread shortage and poor condition of military housing. In testimony before the milcon subcommittees this year, defense officials stated that, at current program levels, it will take years and in some cases decades to provide sufficient housing to our service men and women. As an initial down payment toward addressing this problem, this bill contains an additional $425 million for the construction and improvement to military housing and troop housing. This addition will allow for the construction of nearly 1,200 family housing units, 20 new barracks, as well as substantial renovations to family and single family housing.

I know that the construction of roads and buildings does not grab the headlines like weapons procurement or foreign policy debates. But for the young soldier and his or her family who need clean, affordable housing, this bill can make a real impact in their daily life and may, in fact, make the difference as to whether they remain a ''military family'' or leave the service.

As a member of the National Security Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, I have seen first hand the very real commitment to our military of both Chairwoman VUCANOVICH and Chairman HEFLEY and the ranking members, Mr. HEFNER and Mr. ORTIZ. This bill reflects their wise leadership and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I have before me a letter from the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste. In this letter, there is a description of the proposed Army Museum as ''the theater of the absurd.'' Mr. Chairman, every American should resent those words.

I was privileged to be part of the congressional delegation that represented America at the D-day commemoration last year, the hundreds of graves near Normandy.

I have also been, years ago, to the scene of another army defense, a place called Corregidor.

And for someone to write the words ''the threater of the absurd,'' when you wish to commemorate brave and outstanding heroism of the past, is absurd itself.

Those men and women who wear uniforms today and have worn the uniform in the past make it possible for people like this to write words like this in a free land.

Mr. Chairman, in a larger sense, someone a few moments ago spoke of sacrifice. Let us not forget we ask sacrifice of the young men and young women in uniform.

For them to live in substandard housing is wrong. It is a disgrace. We should give them the very best that we possibly can.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill.

In the past several months, I have worked with both the Authorizing and Appropriations Committees on this bill and have been extremely impressed with their professionalism and commitment to producing a bill that provides the greatest possible quality of life improvements for our military personnel and their families.

I am curious about the concerns of the sponsors of the amendments to this bill based on my experiences with these two committees. While I am not a member of either the National Security Committee or the Military Construction Subcommittee, nor is anyone from the State of Iowa.

However, when the community of Sioux City presented the committee with the critical need for resurfacing the runway used by the 185th Air National Guard—a runway that is almost 10 years overdue for reconstruction—the committee listened to the case, agreed it was a priority, and included it in the bill.

The Military Construction Appropriations Committee evaluates projects on their merits. Sometimes that might result in a few changes from the administration's request, but this bill is under budget, it is properly authorized, and it was put together by a chairwoman whose only concern is producing the best possible bill.

I am as tough on unnecessary military spending as any Member of this Congress, but the facts concerning the critical needs in this area speak for themselves.

Thanks to Chairwoman VUCANOVICH, the families of pilots who fly in the 185th will not have to worry whether their loved ones will be working under unsafe conditions any longer.

I applaud her work and support this bill.

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

I support this bill, and I will oppose amendments to this bill, and I plan to vote against the Browder amendment to cut funds for the museum.

But I would like to make a couple of statements. I have been, or was, chairman of the military construction for many, many years. With my ranking minority member at the time, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], we started this quality-of-life movement. Many years ago we visited bases all over this country and we found conditions that these people were living in were atrocious.

I would just like to make this point: I wish over the years that across the river the higher-ups and the generals would have made as much a priority of quality of life for our men and women in the service as they have gone to bat for this museum that we are considering here today.

As chairman of this committee, I remember years ago we did one museum for the Navy, and it was all paid for out of private funds. There were no taxpayers' money involved.

I guess what I just would like to say is that I am glad we are moving in the direction we now have on our committee. We have a committee here that looks after the living conditions of our men and women in service, and I would just hope that our generals in the Pentagon, both active and retired, would put as much a priority on the quality of life for our men and women in the service, as they do for a shrine here in Washington for the exploits of our brave servicemen over the years.

I plan to reluctantly vote against this particular amendment from the gentleman from Alabama. But I just wanted to say those few words because it perturbs me when I see the emphasis being so much on this one particular issue, while over the years the quality of live has been ignored before this committee over many, many years.

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

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I stand today as a strong supporter of the military and of our national defense. I have a brother and a father who are retired military.

I also will support final passage of the bill. But I am a member of the Committee on the Budget, and as such have spent the last few months working on the budget and cutting spending, et cetera.

I have a question on one of the amendments today relative to two particular requests that I understand were not requested by the military, by the Navy, in the appropriations bill. One of them is $6 million for a foundry renovation and modernization in a shipyard which had been closed by the Base Closing Commission and, as I said, was not requested. The other is $10.4 million earmarked for a physical fitness center in another shipyard that already has a physical fitness center. So, since the Navy did not request this, my question, very simply, is: I would like to ask that this amendment be supported for eliminating these two projects.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Act. Allow me first to congratulate the chairwoman on her hard work. This bill is about quality of life for our members of the armed services.

H.R. 1817 employs sage and sound reasoning. Everything contained in this bill was authorized, and is fully consistent with the House-passed budget resolution. But more importantly, this bill addresses the crisis of military facilities. The main concern of this legislation, as should be the case, is the quality of life for the men, women, and their families, who serve in the Armed Forces. This is not a pork bill.

This is a necessary bill. The past decade of declining defense budgets have come at a steep cost. Readiness and morale have suffered drastically. H.R. 1817 addresses this concern—300,000 military families lack adequate housing. Nearly two-thirds of all on-base housing is substandard. It is important to note that a full 40 percent of all funds in this bill will go directly to family housing.

In addition, this bill contains important and necessary funds for Camp Blanding, a National Guard installation in my district, as part of the funding for critical construction projects. These projects are required and necessary. They would be used to replace the waste water treatment system, which was built in the late 1930's. The existing system has already been in service for 15 years past its life expectancy. Furthermore, Camp Blanding has been issued a letter of noncompliance by the Department of Environmental Regulation for inadequate chlorine residuals. Their water exceeds the national secondary drinking water regulation's maximum contamination level for iron. Mr. Chairman, the amazing thing is that Camp Blanding is not an aberration, but typical of bases across the country. At the very least, our fighting forces need—they deserve—access to clean drinking water.

The military value of such projects should be obvious. Camp Blanding's inadequate facilities must be upgraded to meet military and

environmental standards. But more importantly, Camp Blanding's facilities must be upgraded because we owe it to our Nation's soldiers. They should not be forced to live in substandard and inadequate quarters. Mr. Chairman, we need to send a message to our forces that we care, that they are important to us. Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford not to pass this bill, for projects like Camp Blanding and all the other bases in similar positions.

This legislation is necessary for the readiness and morale of our Nation's troops. We must pass this legislation to improve the quality of life for our soldiers. They deserve our respect; they have earned it. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It contains sound principles and strong medicine for an ailing and antiquated base structure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an ''aye'' vote on final passage.

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct a statement made by the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who stated that a $6 million project is being appropriated for a navy yard in Philadelphia which is being closed.

The fact is the navy yard itself is scheduled for closure, but the propeller shop and foundry is not scheduled. This is what this $6 million is for, improvements to that facility, which is going to remain open and which is needed by the Navy.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1817

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, 1996, 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, $625,608,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That of this amount, not to exceed $50,778,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HERGER

Mr. HERGER. 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. HERGER: Page 2, line 12, strike ''$625,608,000'' and insert ''$611,608,000''.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support this amendment to the Army's military construction budget.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

□ 1245

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will object.

Mr. HEFNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, could the gentlewoman withhold that request until the gentleman finishes his remarks and I can find out how many Members want to speak on this bill?

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to do that, and we will talk about it in between times.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will object to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is withdrawn.

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support this amendment to the Army's military construction budget. This amendment eliminates $14 million in taxpayer dollars to purchase 7 acres of private land for the purpose of building a national army museum.

Mr. Chairman, let me be clear, we should always strongly support our military, and I will continue to do so. This amendment does not, in any way, move to belittle the brave Americans that served or trivialize the tremendous sacrifices that they have made for this country. Indeed, I support the building of the A museum dedicated to the soldiers of our Nation's Army—I simply believe it should be built on existing Federal lands.

The issue here is not whether the museum should be built, but rather where it should be built and more importantly can the Federal Government afford the $14 million price tag. I believe the American taxpayer would agree that $2 million an acre is a bit too much. Not only does this land acquisition cost the taxpayer, it denies private ownership and decreases revenues by taking the property off the tax rolls.

The Federal military already owns almost 650,000 acres of land when only 7 of which is needed for the museum. In fact, right here in the Washington area, we have Fort McNair, Fort Meyer, and the property surrounding the Pentagon that could be used to establish this museum. Mr. Chairman, I also understand that there may be a Federal department or two available in the near future. But my point is, I find it difficult to believe that the Army cannot find 7 acres somewhere in this country that would adequately accommodate the building of a museum. I do not see why we should spend additional taxpayer dollars to purchase more land when plenty of Federal property is already available.

If this Nation is to ever reduce the size of Government, then this Congress has to control spending where we can.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does precisely that. It cuts unnecessary Federal spending and sends a clear message to all Federal agencies, that this Congress is committed to not making the Federal Government any larger than it already is. Why should we allocate scarce taxpayer dollars for more land instead of utilizing abundant existing lands. It simply does not make fiscal or common sense. I urge my colleagues to save taxpayer dollars and vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], has offered his amendment which is similar to the Browder amendment. It is the same amendment. We are both supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it very clear we have heard some very impassioned pleas today which the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] and I will agree that we want to honor American men and women who have served in our military. We are very concerned about this. But what we are saying is that there is a way to do this without having American taxpayers spend this money that increases the national debt for a museum that is the 49th museum in the United States. We have plenty of space for this.

Let me point out a few things:

First, the Army already has 48 museums in the United States. They have them up here in this area. This land is not necessary to have a museum in the Washington area.

Second, in effect we are spending this money that we do not have for a museum that would be the 49th museum.

Third, in a time of budgetary restraint it is unreasonable to make this expenditure of public funds when private donations sufficient to cover the purchase are apparently available.

Fourth, if we do spend this money to get this land, it may be that we just add more land because we may not get the money from the private donations to buy it.

Fifth, the CBO estimates that my amendment saves $14 billion in authority and $2.2 million in outlays.

The Citizens Against Government Waste have written to us today about this issue saying we move through an unusual military theater of operations, the theater of the absurd. A museum is not absurd, and men and women who have fought in the military are not absurd, but this money spent in this way is absurd. How many museums do we really need when we are going $180 billion in debt next year.

This is a very important amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I really do wish that people would talk to American men and women and American taxpayers rather than the generals who see this as an opportunity to put this monument here in this area, and there is a better way of doing this, and we can send that message to them now and tell them by doing this, by the way, we are creating this money that can be spent on family housing, that can be spent on training, that can be spent on impact aid for children or some other source. I do not know whether it can be done in this budget, in this particular bill, but it can be spent in other areas, and I urge support for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends approving this project, which was included in the administration's budget request.

General Sullivan, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Lieutant General Dominy, the Director of the Army Staff, and the Honorable Joe Reeder, the Under Secretary of the Army have all relayed that this is the Army's No. 1 priority. They strongly believe that:

The United States is the only major Nation that does not have a national Army museum in its Capital.

The essence of the American Army is the citizen-soldier. The museum will serve as a tribute to those people, telling the story of how they lived, served, and died for the Nation throughout our history, and explaining the reasons for their sacrifice and the high cost of armed conflict.

They further point out that:

It is important for the public to understand the role and mission of a military force in a democracy, and the part citizens play both by serving in the military and by monitoring our Armed Forces.

The museum will have a distinct military value, providing archival research for military historians as well as daily support to the Army's leadership.

After a 10-year search and study of over 60 potential sites, the Army has decided on a site within the extended monumental core of Washington, which will facilitate access for 1 million visitors each year.

Anticipated savings of $2 million per year will be realized by moving the Center of Military History from leased space into Army-owned space.

The Army's proposal is to acquire this site with appropriated funds, and to build the National Museum of the U.S. Army entirely with donated funds.

It is the committee's view that construction of such a facility with nonappropriated funds is entirely fitting, in recognition of the Army's role in the development of the Nation.

Both the Army and the committee have looked very hard at this land acquisition project, and the Army's best estimate is that it can be accomplished for $14 million, rather than the $17 million that was requested. That estimate is the basis for the committee's recommendation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. We are speaking about a tribute, tribute to soldiers. It is that simple. What we need to do is to purchase the land so that donations across our country can build this museum as a tribute to our soldiers.

I was struck by what the gentleman from Virginia said a few moments ago, that we are losing our sense of history. We in this country must regain that sense of history, particularly for the young people, those who come to Washington, those that wish to learn, those that are impressionable, because, if they see what their forefathers, particularly the soldier forefathers, thought the Army's 220-year history has done, has done for freedom, they will have a better understanding of not just the Army, but of our Nation.

We have an obligation to our soldiers. We have an obligation to our veterans, and especially those Americans who lost loved ones in uniform, to show how America's soldiers lived, and served, and died for our Nation throughout the Army's entire history.

We have an obligation as well to ensure that our society and the military do not grow apart. There is a real problem should that happen. In 1950, there were 3.9 soldiers for every 1,000. In 1996, there will be less than 2 soldiers for every 1,000 citizens. We need for Americans, young people and older folks as well, who have no contact with our Nation's Army, to understand the role, and the best place would be in a museum of this sort.

I oppose the amendment.

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

Let me start off by offering my congratulations to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] for a remarkable job in presenting a very fair and balanced, and I think effective, piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, one of the more important skills, it seems to me, that any legislator should possess is the ability to separate emotions from merits, and I would suggest that this amendment is a true test of that skill. I want to assure the Chair and the Members of this body that I have the utmost respect for both the gentleman from Alabama, as well as the gentleman from California. But I would also suggest that on this occasion we differ, because this amendment, while very long on emotion, Mr. Chairman, falls very short on the merits, and I wanted to associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] when he said that he respected the Citizens Against Government Waste. I am proud to say that I have earned their taxpayer hero award in the past. I have my little hat that I like to wear on important occasions. But my respect does not cloak them in a gown of infallibility, and indeed on this issue they are dead wrong.

Let me make just a few points about some of the things that we raised in their letter that they circulated this morning. The first, that the Army already has 48 museums, is misleading at best. Most of these facilities are nothing more than a room set aside in some remote facility, some remote post across the United States, same kinds of rooms that are set aside in virtually every branch of the military and cannot, by any reasonable stretch of the imagination, be considered a true museums of the magnitude and scope that is considered here. The second is when they suggest that there is an impropriety or a corporate bailout involved here, and I think that kind of suggestion is simply outrageous. The fact of the matter is that the Army studied this proposal very thoroughly. They considered 60 sites, and it should be noted that this proposal is not just endorsed by the Army. It is, in fact, endorsed by the National Capital Planning Commission. It is endorsed by the Commission on Fine Arts. It is endorsed by the National Park Service, and to my friend from California who stated his concern about local tax base and tax revenues, it is also endorsed by Arlington County, which suggests that perhaps Arlington County residents understand very well the importance of this facility.

Mr. Chairman, the reasoning of this amendment would have us believe that the Secretary of Defense, that the President of the United States, that the Secretary of Army, that the Chief of Staff of the Army, do not care about the welfare of men and women under their command, do not care about the importance of other issues and quality of life.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, that kind of assertion is not just wrong, it is ludicrous, and it is an insult to those good men who have dedicated their lives to the service of this country.

This bill in its inclusion of funds for the National Museum for the U.S. Army is a recognition that we need,

and we certainly deserve that kind of facility, a place where America can go and pay homage and remember the sacrifice that other Americans have made for more than 200 years in the name of liberty and freedom; a place to honor and to ensure that we never forget the glory, we never forget the heroes, but, most importantly, we never forget the sacrifices that are made to obtain and retain democracy.

To reject that need it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, is not an act in service to the U.S. Army. It is rather an insult to every man and women who has ever worn the uniform.

I have heard here today we should go and ask the men and women in the Army what they believe. I have no doubt in my mind that, if asked, they would think and they would say very clearly, this facility is a place that is necessary and a place of reverence to democracy, and they would endorse it wholeheartedly.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, as one who is a former member of the U.S. Army——

Mr. MCHUGH. I am not, sir.

Mr. VOLKMER. I am. I wanted you to know I strongly support the amendment. You have asked one, I have told you.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would still suggest, in all reverence to the gentleman's service, that I have an Army facility with more than 30,000 people of Army service on it, and I have talked to many of them, and they do support it. It is my belief that that in fact would be almost unanimous across the spectrum. I call for the rejection of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Browder amendment.

As a member of the Military Construction Subcommittee I have a deep respect and support for the chair of the subcommittee, Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Along with ranking member HEFNER, Chair VUCANOVICH has brought to the floor a well crafted and very fair bill.

Most importantly, the bill takes a strong stand against the abhorrent living conditions forced upon many military families. The living conditions of our soldiers and their families are a problem that has been ignored by the Department of Defense and the executive branch for decades. It is a problem the Military Construction Subcommittee has historically championed.

When Defense Secretary Perry recently asked to meet with subcommittee members on pressing housing needs, it was a breath of fresh air. Finally, someone at the Pentagon had woken up to the fact that the housing of our troops is woefully inadequate.

There is a $3 billion backlog for family housing. The barracks deficit is $8.5 billion. The Pentagon says the Army's share of the barracks deficit will take 23 years to eliminate.

And then, there are the children of those military families who must live in the housing we provide.

When during subcommittee hearings, I asked the Army what they were doing for the adolescent children of military families. I was informed that, for this year, there will be an $8.5 million program to provide school aged children and adolescents with activities targeted to prevention of at-risk behaviors.

The Army gave a glowing report of computer centers, and sports programs that were supported by this program.

But there is always a last word.

In this case, the final words were: ''However, due to limited resources, the Army is not currently funded to continue these programs in fiscal year 1996 and beyond.''

This was, and I repeat was, an $8.5 million program to help teens deal successfully with the unique problems they face as children of military personnel.

This was a program the Army chose to highlight as a successful, unique program for troubled adolescents. But the Army's limited resources are forcing its closure.

It is within this context that I support the Browder amendment and that I oppose the Army Museum project.

The Department's request for the museum is $17 million. This request is for land acquisition only—for 7 acres only—that's $2.4 million an acre. Are these 7 acres plated in gold?

How the Defense Department can with any clear conscience come to Congress and discuss with us the emergency of housing conditions, and at the same time request $17 million to purchase 7 acres for a museum, is beyond me. There are thousands of locations, where, at a cost more suited to this Nation's budget situation, the Army could put this museum.

It is unfortunate that this project was included in the bill. To Chair VUCANOVICH's credit, the request was limited to $14 million.

But it should be removed altogether.

Every Member of Congress and every citizen of the United States holds great respect and appreciation for our soldiers in the Army. Every soldier makes a deep, personal sacrifice to protect our Nation's freedom. The Army's legacy deserves honor and respect.

There should be a place for all Americans to go and remember, and to discover, the unique role the Army has played in this great Nation's history. But now is not the time for this project.

Maybe at a different time and a less costly location, but now we face a real housing crisis. This crisis affects those who serve now, today. Programs to help the increasing population of adolescents are being eliminated. These kids are a part of the military family, and they are struggling right now.

I urge my colleagues to support the Browder amendment and dedicate these funds to those serving in the Army today. There will be a time to support this project, but it is not now and it is not at this location.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It was requested by the U.S. Army. It was the Army that said this was one of their top priorities in order to provide a place which pays tribute to the young men and women who have served so valiantly on behalf of this country in an Army uniform throughout the history of this Nation.

They said they wanted this money, and this was with the blessing of the administration. They said they needed $17 million as a top priority to purchase land which has become available by a willing seller in the National Capital area, land that is within close proximity to this building. They said that they are going to build a museum funded with private dollars, not Federal dollars, but they need the start-up capital to acquire the land on which that museum would be located.

They said they have been conducting a 10-year search, and that they believe very strongly that on the heels of that search, with this land available and with private funds now in the pipeline to build this museum, that they can in fact do what every other service has done, and that is build a National Museum to represent their service—the U.S. Army.

I do not think it is an unusual or unreasonable request. I agree with everything else that the gentleman that just preceded me said. Unfortunately, we do have a situation in which 60 percent of the facilities available to the young people in uniform today are inadequate, and we are addressing those problems. Some of the very same people that will speak in favor of this bill are going to be decrying other portions of the bill, saying we are spending too much money on trying to provide for the young men and women in the service.

Well, that is what we are doing here. We are providing for these people by just giving them a little opportunity to express their pride in the service they have made for the country. Frankly, not all of them gave that service lightly. Some paid with their limbs, some paid with their health, and some paid with their lives, and it seems to me that it is a small token of our appreciation to purchase the land on which the museum can be built with private

funds to thank them for that dedicated service.

So I hope that we will acknowledge that this is not pork-barrel spending. In fact, this committee, the Committee on Appropriations, and this subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada, has worked within their budget caps. We have a bill that conforms to the budget resolution that this Congress adopted just a month ago.

So we are not busting the budget. We are acting in response to what the administration and the Pentagon and the folks in the military uniform wish us to do. I think it is penny wise and pound foolish, as well as pretty mean-spirited, to tell them no, to tell them we are not going to provide land so you can build your museum.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment to strike $14 million from the Army's construction account, funds currently intended to acquire land that has been sitting for years, for a new Army Museum near the Pentagon.

I believe there are many reasons to oppose the military construction appropriations bill, but I can think of no more glaring example of unnecessary spending than this museum. Even for those who support the appropriations measure, the amendment is a common sense effort to improve the final bill. We in Congress must make every effort possible to eliminate spending for programs, no matter the level of funding, which are not justifiable, in order to be able to both balance our budget and have resources available for investments in our Nation's future.

As a new Member of Congress, I have tried to approach this issue objectively by asking some basic questions about priorities. Should an Army Museum get a higher priority than military housing or other assistance for military personnel and their families, at the same time that dozens of military installations are being slated for base closure, is it prudent to spend funds, funds we do not have, to acquire land for an Army Museum?

How would this museum contribute to military readiness or preparedness? Do we have extra money in our country's bank account, or are we in fact already beyond our ready reserve limit?

My conclusion was that it was time for us to be honest with ourselves. This museum, I do not believe, is about preserving artifacts. If it were, we would be helping the many other Army Museums that are literally falling apart in our country, with important artifacts of our history rotting away in those museums.

What we need here today is to have some common sense. That is what the American people are asking us to have. Let us show real respect for our Army personnel. Let us take care of our existing facilities in this country before building another new one.

Finally, with our country's deficit in the condition that it is in today, we have no business thinking about a proposal like this. I am surprised that a proposal like this would be in the bill. Let us take a step today toward changing the way Washington operates. Let us vote for this amendment to eliminate a needless spending project.

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman for his remarks. I think they are right on target as far as Members of Congress attempting to set priorities and spending patterns of what we are doing up here. Even though the gentleman who is the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations spoke earlier that even though it is within 902 allocation, et cetera, and it is their money, so they can spend it any way they want, well, I do not know. I thought we were up here on taxpayers' business. I thought it was the taxpayers who really we were supposed to be responsible to, not just to each other. That talk sounded to me like it was just like we were responsible only to each other.

As I look at this as a person who thinks about my taxpayers, I heard one earlier person say this morning arguing for this museum that it is only $14 million. ''Only $14 million.'' Well, folks, hey, back home, $14 million is a whole bunch of money. A whole bunch of money. It is not just ''only $14 million.'' And then you add to that, it is for 7 acres—$14 million for 7 acres?

The gentleman from Minnesota, I bet you got a lot of land that your taxpayers would like to sell to the Pentagon at $2 million an acre, do you not?

Mr. LUTHER. I think I could find some of that land.

Mr. VOLKMER. I think I could find a whole bunch of it in my district. That is completely unheard of, to spend this kind of money, taxpayers' money, at the same time when we look at the total picture, not just military construction, when we look at the total picture, we are going to have complete cut-out of low income energy assistance for your people and my people so they can theoretically buy 7 acres of ground to put a museum on for the U.S. Army. Well, as a former member of the U.S. Army, I want to tell you, my priorities are for my taxpayers and my people, not for a museum that we do not think we need at this time.

□ 1315

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into an agreement with the gentlewoman.

Since we have established earlier that the House was going to try to complete their business by 2, if it is agreeable and we can accommodate everybody, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 15 minutes until 2.

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to agree on that on our side, but I think the time should be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, the request is for this one amendment and all amendments thereto. I do not know of any substitutes or amendments to this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises that the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], will be recognized for 15 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, if there is going to be a limitation on this amendment and all amendments thereto to end at 1:45 and there are other amendments pending, when will they be considered?

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

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious we are not going to be able to finish this bill today. I would assume that we would come back next Tuesday and continue the bill. This takes us to the time when the House will adjourn for the week, and we will come back on next week and we will have a vote on this one single amendment and get this amendment out of the way. That is what my request was.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I just wanted to make that clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already allocated the time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

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

Mr. Chairman, let me outline again the purpose of this amendment. The purpose of my amendment was not to eliminate the building of this museum in honor of the Army and those who have fought valiantly for our country over the centuries of our Nation's history. That is not the purpose.

The purpose of this amendment was to save $14 million to allow us to be able to go ahead and construct this

museum. I might mention that the Army has indicated that this would not be done with taxpayers' dollars. It would be done by private donations, but to do so on land that the Federal Government already owns, to do so on land, for example, which is adjacent to it, Fort Myer, of which there is ample property to build a museum, or perhaps at the Pentagon on part of their parking lot where, again, there is ample land to build this museum, both of which are directly adjacent to the proposed site.

Again, during a time when we are looking at the $200 billion budget deficits, $14 million is not insignificant, when we can go out and do it with property that already exists, I believe we should do so.

So, again, I would urge the House to vote in favor of this amendment to eliminate this $14 million expenditure but to do so by building, again, this museum on land that already exists, already is owned by the Federal Government.

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

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

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

What this is about is that history is important. We have an obligation to continue teaching the lessons of history and remember our military experiences as they have evolved. As our Army becomes smaller, it is more important that we continue that.

This museum will be a recognition of this. To compare this museum with its over 500,000 items and artifacts to the small museums that the Army has scattered across the country is really misleading. The Army museum system today consists of a very disparate collection of localized branch-specific museums. These local collections offer a look at the past from the perspective of their particular area of interest, whether transportation or aviation or logistics, but this museum steps back to look at the experience of the American soldier going back to revolutionary times touched by all aspects of Army life during a long and proud history.

I think we can have a consolidation of some of these smaller museums if this moves ahead. But to get to the money issues that have been addressed, Mr. Chairman, for every dollar in public contribution that will go forward to buying this land, we expect a match of over $5 from the private and volunteer sector coming in. That is money well spent in this particular case.

At a time when the Army is getting one recruit for over 100 contacts it makes, this will be a good effort to increase the contacts the Army makes to over 200,000 people a year. So I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I also wanted to commend the gentleman from California for offering this amendment in light of all the opposition that appears to come from members of the Committee on Appropriations on military construction, but I think, as I said previously, we all should stop and think of what we are doing here. We are actually spending $14 million, which is not a small amount of money, for 7 acres of ground, 7 acres.

Now, to me that is a whole bunch, that is $2 million an acre. I do not know where you have to buy land to get it for $2 million an acre, but I guarantee you that the gentleman in the chair, the Chairman, has a whole bunch that he would like to sell to the U.S. Army for $2 million an acre. I have got a whole bunch I would like to sell.

But that is not the bottom line. The bottom line is, we are in a budget-cutting and a cost-cutting mood here and I commend the Congress for that. I believe in a balanced budget, but I also believe we need to establish priorities.

Now, when we go about cutting such things as money for school lunches, when we cut money for senior citizens, when we cut money out of low-income energy assistance, when we cut other programs for other people, then come up and say, now, here is $14 million that you can pay for 7 acres of ground in order to build a museum on, folks, I think if I go back and ask the people of my district about that, I think I know what the answer is going to be. I really think the answer is going to be, no, we would rather have that money spent on maybe a farm program.

Agriculture is taking a big cut under this budget. I would love to have $14 million more back in that agriculture budget. I would love to have $14 million more back in higher education, student loans, grants, I would love to have it there. I think that is more important than $14 million for 7 acres of ground, when I understand in Arlington County, it is only assessed at $10 million. Why are we paying $14 million for 10 million dollars' worth of grounds? The building on it is not any good. We all know that. Anybody that has ever been there knows that it is almost a wasted area.

I just do not understand it, folks. When you establish priorities, I though that people were more important than things. It appears here the things are going to be more important than people.

It appears that if you listen to all the Members in the debate, that this thing, this museum, and by the way, I am a former member of the U.S. Army, very proud of the fact, but I do not believe that we need to spend our money, this $14 million at this time on this museum.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. It just bothers me when I see some of these Members who every time they mention the word ''war,'' mention the word ''military,'' or ''armed forces,'' all of a sudden, some of these biggest spenders in the Congress all of a sudden become deficit hawks. That really bothers me.

My good friend from Missouri who just spoke is up here worried about this bill because we are spending too much money. I went over to pull out all of these lists that I carry around with me, because I do not like Members to be inconsistent. I want them to be consistent when they come on the floor. I find my good friend from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] listed as one of the biggest spenders in the Congress. And so all of a sudden, he is a deficit hawk.

Now, so much for credibility. Now, I just want to tell you this, I am looking at this report from the Committee on Appropriations, and nobody has taken them to task more than I have over the years. As I mentioned before, I will be introducing a bill later this afternoon or Monday at the latest with $840 billion; that is not million, that is not three quarters of a billion, that is $840 billion in spending cuts.

I wanted all of you people who are worried about this $14 million to come out here and vote for that bill or even cosponsor it. Then you will show me some guts. In the meantime, looking at this appropriation report, there is $14 million appropriated. Let me read you what it says. It says, Fort Myer Army museum land acquisition. It does not say anything about a particular piece of property.

I know the gentleman is sponsoring a resolution. He is a true deficit hawk and he means well. But we need to work this out with the Army. If we can find a better place or a cheaper place to do it, fine. The problem is, we want the war museum. We want those people who have died and sacrificed for their country to have their families be able to come here and look at those artifacts.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me mention this. It was mentioned why not build the museum on Fort Belvoir or Fort Myer. It is prohibited to build the museum or any museum on that. That is why we have to do it here.

□ 1330

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me just say that that gentleman is also from Missouri, Mr. Chairman. I have hanging on my wall a picture of one of the great Presidents of this country. His name was Harry S. Truman. I was in the Marine

Corps at the time he was here in Washington. I was proud of him, and I was a Democrat at the time. That is a good Democrat there. He would oppose this amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Harry Truman would never have built this museum.

Mr. SOLOMON. Yes, he would, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I wish I could resolve the issue of how Mr. Truman would have voted on this particular proposal. I am not confident of Mr. Truman's vote.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring this body's attention back to the question of how do we balance this budget, and how do we set our priorities as a country. I would like to refer the body to legislation that was passed in 1994. It was the fiscal year 1995 defense authorization report that accompanied that legislation, and was signed by the President. It includes in it a guideline that was developed in the U.S. Senate.

The Senate developed a 5-part test for whether or not military construction projects ought to be approved. The Porkbusters Caucus in the House of Representatives has adopted that test.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read one part of that test: ''We should not appropriate money for military construction unless the project is necessary for reasons of the national security of the United States.''

Regardless of what our opinion ought to be of museums, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we should not be including in military construction, funds for museum sites and museums. We have the Smithsonian Institution. Certainly it can operate museums in the District and in the neighboring territory. We do not have to include this in our military construction budget, especially when we are trying to care for the needs of the men and women in the Armed Forces, and we have heard about the deplorable conditions in housing and the need for military construction in a variety of other ways.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this Chamber to respect this principle that has been developed and signed into law by the United States, that emphasizes that we only spend money in military construction for reasons of national security.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think we need to remember here what we are talking about is, and the chairman would understand this, Mr. Chairman, being from Nebraska, what we are talking about is planting seed. We are talking about $14 million here that is the seed to go into the ground, to grow and flourish to become a beautiful plant that we can all be proud of somewhere down the line.

The question is, Do we believe that museums to honor our heritage and our history are important? I happen to think they are important, so I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have gone to many of the Army museums around the country that have been mentioned here today. They are little divisional museums of one kind or another, and I am excited about them. I am the kind of guy that can get emotional walking up and down the historic Halls of this building. I go on the battlefield and I can smell the smoke and hear the guns. I love that kind of thing.

Yet, here we have a nation, the only nation in the world, only major nation in the world, that does not have some kind of an Army museum; not a dozen divisional museums, or 40 divisional museums, but a museum for the Army of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I fly in every week, practically, into Washington, DC. When I come into National, many of the Members have had this experience, when I come into National, if I am on the left-hand side of the airplane I look out and I see the wonderful monuments honoring the freedom and liberty and history of this country: The Washington Monument, the Lincoln Monument, Jefferson Memorial, all the way up to the Capitol of the United States.

However, if I am on the right side of the airplane, I see acre after acre of stark white tombstones. What this tells me is what I have on the left-hand side of the airplane was bought with a price from what is on the right-hand side of the airplane. I think that is what the Army museum is all about. It is telling us the price that was paid for this country's freedom and liberty.

I think we ought to honor it. I think we ought to support that museum. It is a small portion of the $72 million that will be raised privately. It is a partnership between the seed that we put in and the private money which comes. Support the Army museum. Vote against this amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, we are coming down to the vote. Let us lay out here what we have. We could have debated this earlier this week when we were talking about the authorization bill, about this museum and whether we needed to spend this money. I had an amendment which would have sent this money to military family housing. That amendment for some strange reason was not made in order, so this body could not debate it.

What we have now is an opportunity to answer this question in a very simple way: Do we want to spend $14 million on this project? The Army generals, the Army brass, want this project. They have figured out sticking it in here, running it through with a good package, a good package that both sides have worked on, stick it in, run it through, nobody can stop it.

Mr. Chairman, we have to stop it. We have to decide what we are going to do, send this message to them, tell them to come back next year and let us debate this issue on this floor, and we will make that decision. I am sure we will make the wise decision. However, right now the wise decision is to support this amendment, and let us debate this at a later time.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I had 2 minutes. I am glad I am getting up now, or I would end up with none.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. I would like to say that our country is still a young nation compared to Europe. Do we realize that freedom really does not come easily? What is wrong with honoring freedom by having this museum? Russia is. They are honoring those who kept the German Panzer divisions out of Russia. They are building a wonderful museum that costs three times more than what we are trying to do here today.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that a million Americans will visit this Army museum. Some of them will be young Americans. They will be impressed. They will join the Army. This is a good recruiting tool. Mr. Chairman, let me say that the military is in trouble on recruiting. They are not meeting their goals. Anything that can help the military to get young men and women into the service, that is what we need. Part of this museum will be dedicated to the National Guard and Reserve. I will point out that the National Guard, 29th Division of World War II, landed at Omaha Beach. They lost 2,000 young men from one State fighting at Omaha Beach. That will be shown, what sacrifices have been made by Americans who were in the Army. I totally oppose this amendment, and hope the Members will, too.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of funding for the National Museum of the U.S. Army.

The bill provides $17 million for land acquisition, but the rest of the cost will come from private donations.

This museum is expected to draw more than 1 million visitors a year to see the great history of our Army and the role it has played in the development, and in the defense, of our country.

One thing I especially like is that it in addition to covering the achievements of active duty Army soldiers since 1775, it will also have a section devoted to the National Guard and Reserves.

I would point out that at the invasion of Normandy 51 years ago this month, the 29th division of National Guardsmen stormed onto Omaha Beach as part of the expeditionary force. They lost 2,000 young men on D-Day.

That event, as well as other stories of bravery and sacrifice over the years, will be on display at the Twin Bridges site. This comprehensive look at the Army, from then until now, will provide future generations of Americans a chance to see the realities of war and the effect it has had not only on the soldiers, but on their loved ones as well.

The Army is the only service branch not to have a national museum. Yet, the U.S. Army is 220 years old—older than the country itself.

This museum will be a deserving tribute to that storied history and worthy recognition to all those who have served in the U.S. Army. It will also help educate the American people about military life, in wartime and in peace. It is a worthy project. I hope we will reject the amendment and keep the funding for the museum.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want the body to know that I rise in support of this amendment. I do so with some very serious sensitivity, because I am getting all kinds of messages from a variety of Members of the House, but I have heard the arguments from the top brass in the Army, how this museum would be a national treasure to commemorate the hard work of every enlisted man and women in the Army.

Therefore, I decided last night to call some of my own folks who happen to be in the military services. Their message was entirely different. I spoke with 6 different soldiers in 4 different Army commands in my district, which is the place where the National Training Center for the Army is located.

I let them know that today we would be considering the military construction bill, legislation which provides funds for military housing, base improvements, and other quality of life needs. I asked them specifically, would they like to have $14 million of these funds set aside to buy the land for a National Museum for the Army in their honor in Washington.

Each and every one of the 6 of them said they would rather have those funds go to housing or other quality of life items which they desperately need. I told each and every one of them that there was a large amount of additional funding already in the bill for housing. Our chairman has done a great job. It did not matter to any of them. A national museum in their honor was not on their priority list.

I told one soldier that this was a priority to the Army Command in Washington. He responded ''That is because they do not have to live in the housing that we do.'' He told me that he has men living in temporary barracks that were constructed during World War II. His room is 11 by 12 feet in space, with temporary walls, and one of the bigger rooms. He also said that he has men and women driving 40 miles to work every day because there is not adequate housing.

Mr. Chairman, to say the least, while I have mixed emotions about this, this is not a priority to the men and women who are currently in the Army in my district in California.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time. I really regret I do not have enough time to say nearly everything I want to say.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I absolutely, absolutely oppose this amendment. I regret that the amendment is even on the floor. We resoundly defeated this amendment in our subcommittee in the Committee on National Security earlier. In fact, to me it represents a great disdain for the heritage of those who have served the U.S. Army. We are not fighting the issue of quality of life.

This bill added $813 million extra for housing. We are dealing with the quality of life issue. However, Mr. Chairman, my experience is not in the Army, it is in the U.S. Air Force. Whenever the Nation called me, I went. I left my family and I placed myself in jeopardy in defense of my Nation, and guess what? My Army colleagues have done that for 220 years. In fact, 470,246 members of the United States Army have died on the battlefield. Is it too much to ask for us to put a lousy $14 million in honor of those who have fallen? It is less than $20 a head.

Mr. Chairman, we would be making a giant mistake if we did not shut down this amendment.

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

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am reminded that we are told that one does not live on bread alone. Soldiers do not accomplish their mission on food and forage alone. There is something called spirit and something called morale. My only regret is that this country has not provided the initiative to go forward with a museum honoring the soldiers of this U.S. Army much earlier.

The time has come, Mr. Chairman, We should not accept this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. There is an old adage in the infantry that battles are won and wars are won on things other than money. If this amendment is adopted, we will not put one more nickel into housing, recreation, or anything else. But if this amendment is rejected, the U.S. Army is going to have something that will help all of us who served in previous wars.

Point to what it is that the Army has done. The Army is the only service that has no museum of this kind, and this is the only country of which I am aware of where no such museum exists to remind our veterans and our people of what it is that was done. Veterans say ''We would like to you to remember what we did, and we would like you to remember why we did it.'' A museum will help Americans to understand that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be rejected. Remember, wars are won by morale. Service is enhanced by morale. Look at the British Army. They are all manner of curious troops, and they all serve enthusiastically. Why? Because of loyalty to their service.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the main point of this amendment has been missed. I find it quite ironic that I find myself in virtual complete agreement with those who are speaking against this amendment. I also favor the museum. I also favor our military. I favor us honoring those who have fought bravely for our military and for our country.

□ 1345

That is not the purpose of this amendment. The purpose is, why should we as taxpayers be spending an additional $14 million to purchase more land to build a museum on when we have land already available? Are we not closing down several departments? Are we not downsizing here in Washington?

Do we not have Pentagon property, Fort Myer property, adjacent to this property that the Federal Government and the taxpayers already own? Do we have to go out and buy more property? Do we have to go out and spend, I feel unwisely, more taxpayer dollars?

That is the issue. Again, I support the museum, but I support it being built on presently owned taxpayer property which is in the same area.

I urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

(Mr. MYERS of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I regret that we have run out of time, but I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

I have served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for 25 years. I have offered and supported many amendments to reduce spending. I will take a back seat to no one on cutting and reducing unnecessary spending. I spent 23 years in Army service.

There is a time when we must act. There are those today who believe that the Army does not need and should not have a national museum. The oldest service of the uniformed services should have. We should have taken action to build a museum years ago.

If you believe, as I do, that we should have a museum, then we must act now or the site will be lost to a commercial use, and we will build it sometime at an even greater cost here in our Nation's Capital, or build it in a cornfield someplace where few will ever have the opportunity to enjoy it.

We are all concerned with quality of life for the young people we are asking to serve in defense of freedom. Pride and esprit de corps are also important to these people of whom we are so proud.

Defeat this amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. As I travel toward the District, more Hispanics have received the Congressional Medal of Honor than any other ethnic group. They would like to be included in this museum so that they can display their history of bravery. At this moment I have to oppose my good friend and oppose his amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, sometimes we focus so much on the cost of things, no matter how small, that we lose sight of the value of things, no matter how great.

The National Museum of the U.S. Army is a vision to create at the gateway of Washington, a site that will no longer remain if we don't act now, a tribute to the American soldier. At a time when our Armed Forces are being cut every year, we have to tell the story of the citizen soldiers that have served this Nation, and we must inspire patriotism among our entire society.

That is the purpose of this. That is the purpose. There could be no greater purpose. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and to support the bill.

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

I know a little bit about this subject since the land to be acquired for the purposes of building a national Army museum was originally part of the planned land swap for a portion of Fort Sheridan in my district. Several years ago the Army wished to trade the Fort Sheridan land, plus cash, for the property in Arlington then, and perhaps still, owned by Equitable. While that trade was blocked in the Senate, it was clear that this was a priority for the Army and one that I thought then, and still do now, deserved our support.

A nation's history is contained in its institutions. As a former Army enlisted man, I know the meaning of the traditions and history of the Army to those who don the uniform. The Army has never had a proper place to house and display its history and this land is deemed a very suitable site. There is no money in the bill for construction and that would come only when budgetary times are more propitious.

But if the land cannot be acquired now, it would undoubtedly be sold to others and developed and would be lost for the purpose of an Army museum. While the price may seem high, we thought, from the value of the Fort Sheridan land, that it would likely be even higher than the sum contained in the bill. We should reject the gentlemen's amendment and allow this land acquisition to go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

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

REORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 137, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—261

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Berman
Bilbray
Blute
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Minge
Mink
Moorhead
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torricelli
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—137

Abercrombie
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Callahan
Chambliss
Clinger
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dornan
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Foglietta
Frost
Gejdenson
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green
Gutierrez
Hancock
Hastert
Hefley
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
King
Kingston
Klink
Kolbe
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lowey
Lucas
Manton
Mascara
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McNulty
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Porter
Quillen
Reed
Ros-Lehtinen
Saxton
Schaefer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stump
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Vucanovich
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Bilirakis
Brown (CA)
Buyer
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Cox
Coyne
Dickey
Dooley
Gallegly
Gephardt
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Jefferson
Johnston
Kleczka
Matsui
Meek
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Moakley
Pelosi
Rose
Stokes
Thornton
Tucker
Weldon (FL)
Yates

☐ 1411

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Ballenger, with Mr. Mineta against.

Messrs. CLINGER, KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and WYNN, and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRYANT of Tennessee, KANJORSKI, COMBEST, FRISA, THOMAS, RICHARDSON, EHLERS, RANGEL, STOCKMAN, FORD, FORBES, WALKER, NADLER, BURTON of Indiana FOLEY, DREIER, and BAKER of California changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment are agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT

of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 on the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1817, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable absence, I missed the following votes, and had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 381, ''aye''; rollcall vote 382, ''aye''; rollcall 383, ''aye''; and rollcall vote 384, ''aye''.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to request of the majority leader information about next week's schedule.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], if he would be willing to inform the Members about what we have to look forward to.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House will meet in pro forma session on Monday, June 19. There will be no recorded votes on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 o'clock a.m. for morning hour and 10 o'clock a.m. for legislative business.

After 1-minutes, we plan to take up the rule for H.R. 1854, the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill.

If a recorded vote is ordered on the rule, that vote will be postponed until later in the day.

□ 1415

After debate on the legislative branch rule we will take up House Resolution 168, legislation implementing Corrections Day procedures for the House. Upon completion of this legislation we will hold the recorded vote on the rule accompanying the legislative branch appropriations bill, if a vote was ordered. We then plan to finish H.R. 1817, the fiscal year 1996 military construction appropriations bill and begin debate on the legislative branch appropriations bill. Members should be advised that recorded votes may come as early as 12 noon on Tuesday.

On Wednesday and Thursday the House will meet at 10 a.m. to consider two appropriations bills: H.R. 1868, the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill, subject to a rule; and the fiscal year 1996 energy and water appropriations bill, subject to a rule.

It is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and their districts by no later than 6 p.m. on Thursday. There will be no recorded votes on Friday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. If the gentleman could help us on a matter relating to the Committee on Rules, I understand the Committee on Rules will be meeting on Monday to prepare to bring to the floor on Tuesday some of the rules that the gentleman has alluded to. I am wondering if we could determine what time the Committee on Rules will be meeting. I am one concerned. I will be flying back from California Fathers' Day, Sunday, and I have an interest in the legislative branch bill, of course, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, if I may make a comment, in the original schedule for the month, Monday was to have been a day on which we would have had votes. Because of so many considerations, we did manage to relieve all of the Members at large of votes on Monday, but the Committee on Rules must necessarily meet at 2 o'clock on Monday, and I appreciate that it is an inconvenience in the gentleman's personal life, but hopefully it will be helpful to the rest of the Members we were able to do that.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am hopeful I will be able to get here by 3:30 or 4, the first plane out. Do you expect the Committee on Rules to have completed its work and filed its rules by 4 o'clock? I do not know what the urgency is, but I gather there is some. Is that right?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the Committee on Rules hopes to file by 6 but they would expect to conclude testimony before the committee by about 4:30.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I may be able to get here just for the latter part of that testimony, and I appreciate my friend with his assistance from the standpoint of the staff of the committee.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I would hope the majority leader might be able to give us some indication whether the privileged resolution that was rumored to be taken up this afternoon concerning waivers of the number of committees that a Member is permitted to serve on was going to be brought to the floor. We understand it is not being brought to the floor today. My question is: Do we anticipate a resolution will be brought up next week? If that is the case, can the leader assure us that we will have some opportunity to debate that issue? It is a major concern to many of us, the reforms of the House, as to how many committees a Member can serve on.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we believe it is possible we may bring that up next week, and, of course, it is subject to an hour for debate in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. CARDIN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate that. I would ask the leader if he would consider giving us some notice before that is brought to the floor and yield the customary time to the opponent of that type of a resolution in order that we can have a full debate on the floor of the House.

Mr. ARMEY. We will, of course, do our best to give you good notice, and we will, of course, examine the time constraints and certainly take your request under consideration.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WARD. If I might ask the gentleman from Texas, in looking at next week's schedule, I wonder if you would expect to bring up the billionaire expatriate tax loophole bill.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for your inquiry.

No, I do not anticipate that coming up next week. I have not talked to the Committee on Ways and Means yet, and I do not have any time scheduled for that at this point.

Mr. WARD. Well, if I might ask further, do you think that you could give us notice? I have many constituents who are interested in this bill, many constituents of other Members who have inquired, and if I could ask and seek the leader's help in getting some advance notice so we may know when to anticipate that bill.

Mr. ARMEY. Again, if the gentleman would yield further, we would certainly give you as much advance notice as you may need. You may want to go to the Committee on Rules, any number of things. I have not begun consideration of that bill yet from the Committee on Ways and Means, but certainly will give you every bit of notice we can.

Mr. WARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Could the gentleman tell us when we would be completing our business on Tuesday and Wednesday?

Mr. ARMEY. Each night next week at this point we anticipate being able to be out of here by 6 or 6:30.

Mr. FAZIO of California. No evening next week would normally be expected to be here later?

Mr. ARMEY. If I may tell the gentleman, I have great expectations and