HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, October 16, 1985*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we are appreciative of those people whose love has graced our lives and whose support has been our strength. We are thankful for family and friends who have encouraged us and whose concern has been with us in all the seasons of life. We remember their names in our hearts and pray Your special blessing upon them. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 103, answered "present" 7, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—242

Ackerman
Akaka
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
Barnard
Barnes
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Biaggi
Bliley
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Cooper
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Henry
Hertel
Holt
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
LaFalce
Lantos
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Robinson
Roe
Rostenkowski
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shumway
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron

NAYS—103

Armey
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Carney
Chandler
Clay
Cobey
Coleman (MO)
Conte
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gregg
Grotberg
Gunderson
Hendon
Hiler
Hopkins
Hunter
Ireland
Jacobs
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Monson
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Packard
Parris
Penny
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Roth
Roukema
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shelby
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Swindall
Thomas (CA)
Weber
Wolf
Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Anderson
Dymally
Gordon
Hatcher
Sabo
Schroeder
Snyder

NOT VOTING—82

Addabbo
Alexander
Aspin
AuCoin
Badham
Bedell
Bevill
Boggs
Boland
Bonker
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Bustamante
Chappie
Cheney
Coble
Collins
Conyers
Coughlin
Dickinson
Dixon
English
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank
Franklin
Gingrich
Goodling
Hartnett
Hillis
Horton
Jenkins
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kostmayer
Lehman (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
MacKay
McCain
McCollum
McCurdy
Mineta
Mitchell
Moody
Nelson
O'Brien
Oxley
Pashayan
Pursell
Ritter
Rodino
Rogers
Rose
Schneider
Solarz
St Germain
Staggers
Sweeney
Tallon
Tauke
Torricelli
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Vucanovich
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Whittaker
Williams
Wilson
Wright
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

□ 1225

Mr. RICHARDSON changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2174. An act to provide for the transfer to the Colville Business Council of any undistributed portion of amounts appropriated in satisfaction of certain judgments awarded the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation before the Indian Claims Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amend-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 372) "Joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. LONG, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. LEVIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 2409.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMPETITION IN PAY TELEVISION

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to alert the House to a new American invasion—the invasion of the encryptors. Although this warning may seem a bit amusing, it is a most serious one.

Encryption or scrambling of satellite television signals is being tested now and is planned for full-time use early next year by most major producers of satellite television programming. In other words, Americans who have paid for, and installed home satellite reception systems will soon face a situation where more and more of the programming they now receive will be scrambled, and, thus, denied to them without the benefit of a decoding or descrambling device.

Pay television programmers, like HBO, Cinemax, Showtime, the Disney channel and others, are planning to scramble to protect their right to compensation. That is well and good—provided. Provided that home satellite systems have a fair right to pay for, receive, and descramble those signals.

Last year this House voted to deregulate a relatively new industry—cable television. And we did so because we expected cable TV to operate in a competitive environment. But if cable TV is ever granted the legal or practical exclusive right to distribute America's pay television programming, we will have been responsible for deregulating a virtual monopoly.

H.R. 1840, the Satellite Viewing Rights Act of 1985 seeks to guarantee a competitive environment—ensuring that your constituents and mine will have a real choice between cable and home satellite systems.

I urge you to consider cosponsoring H.R. 1840 before the invasion of the encryptors is upon us.

CONGRESS ADDRESSES PROBLEM OF INTERSERVICE RIVALRY

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, at long last, Congress is finally addressing the problem of interservice rivalry in our Armed Forces. Wonderful. It is about time we are doing something about the Pentagon and the infighting that goes on there. The rivalry among the branches of our services, the Navy, Army, Air Force, Marines, is legendary, as anyone who has served in the Armed Forces can tell you. Most Americans believe that one branch of our Armed Forces would rather win a fight with another branch than win a battle with one of our Nation's adversaries.

Also, because of the sharp separation among our Armed Forces, there are endless duplications and unconscionable added costs. This is one of the reasons our defense budget is so high. The effectiveness of our military is also impaired because of the lack of communication and coordination among the different branches in our Armed Forces. Yes, it is about time that the overweight Pentagon gets down into fighting trim and that we are not caught flatfooted in an increasingly dangerous world.

THE DOD AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the delayed floor action on the DOD authorization conference agreement is resulting in serious repercussions for our enlisted personnel.

An example is the 3-percent military pay raise which was to be effective October 1, 1985. Another example involves the National Guard and Reserve bonus programs. Authority to pay enlistment and reenlistment bonuses expired on September 30, 1985. Once reestablished, the authority cannot be used retroactively.

It is not right that we continue to delay accepting the military conference agreement. It's not the big weapons systems that are affected by this delay—they will eventually come on line. It is the people, those in uniform and those waiting to wear the uniform, who are being hurt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring this military conference agreement to the floor. Let's get with it.

THE COMMUNIST SANDINISTAS

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, many in this body asked: Are the Sandinistas really Communists? Are they really dedicated to making Nicaragua a totalitarian police state, modeled after Cuba?

Well, no longer should there be any doubt. Last night Sandinista Commandante Daniel Ortega suspended human and civil rights in that nation, including the right to free speech, free expression, public assembly, the right to strike, and freedom of the press. Justice Minister Rodrigo Reyes says news censorship "will be total." All sections of the media will now be required to submit their material to the Interior ministry prior to publication or broadcast.

Ortega said,

In response to the terrorist politics of the United States * * * internal pawns of imperialism supported by some political parties, news media outlets, and religious institutions have redoubled their actions to sabotage the defense forces of our homeland.

Cardinal Obando y Bravo a "saboteur"? la prensa a "saboteur" and "pawn of imperialism"? come on, Commandante!

The people of Nicaragua deserve better than this, Mr. Speaker. They wish to live free from totalitarianism, from repression and suppression and, yes, free from communism. The actions, again, on the part of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, are testament to their own war being waged against freedom here in our own hemisphere. Once again, the Communist Sandinistas are showing the world their true colors.

A MORAL OUTRAGE

(Mr. SILJANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SILJANDER. I just recently came back, Mr. Speaker, from the dedication of the new Holocaust Museum. The speakers there were moving, asking us to remember, remember prejudice, remember hatred, remember racism. So it is fitting to continue this desire we have with the Soviet Jews, the starvation in Ethiopia, the suffering blacks in South Africa, as we have in Romania, with

religious and ethnic persecution, and so many other countries, to continue our moral outrage at racist comments such as those made by Reverend Farrakhan regarding the Jewish religion.

I have introduced a resolution condemning Mr. Farrakhan and his association with the Ku Klux Klan and his incredibly wild statements such as quoting Hitler as "a very great man." He said that Israel is "structured on injustice, theory, lying and deceit, using God's name to shield your dirty religion."

While some have said this resolution would only help promote Mr. Farrakhan, he has had rallies with thousands and thousands, recently almost 20,000 in New York, cheering him on. Our moral outrage must stand up and speak out somewhere along the line. How far can we allow Mr. Farrakhan to go before this Congress should speak up and exercise its freedom of speech and condemn Mr. Farrakhan and ask him to please cease and desist in his racist comments toward the Jewish faith.

TERRORISM

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, had the honor this morning of being at the groundbreaking ceremony for the Holocaust Memorial. Mr. Eli Weisel, as the distinguished preceding speaker said, is truly the chronicler and conscience of the Holocaust. This morning, Mr. Weisel involved the memory of an American whose mortal remains are at this moment slowly making their way back to his homeland, the U.S.A. The bullet-punctured remains of Leon Klinghoffer bear cruel testimony to the horror of terrorism in our world today. No one is safe. Not children. Not senior citizens in wheelchairs. As Eli Weisel said at the ceremony this morning, this murder of Mr. Klinghoffer was so vicious, so ugly, so absurd, the shooting of an American in his wheelchair, in the 70th year of his life—organized crime hiding behind political rhetoric. But Leon did not disappear beneath the waves. William Shakespeare said it well in his play, "Hamlet," that "murder, though it has no tongue, will speak with most miraculous organ * * *."

Leon Klinghoffer in death has given the lie to the absurd remarks of terrorist Mr. Abbas and those apologists of terror around the world who have said that Mr. Klinghoffer probably died of a heart attack. Yes, a Mafia heart attack—that's a bullet in the brain.

I address you, President Mubarak. There are many of us in this House who are glad that you are the President of Egypt, but we implore you, before a stronger message is sent to you from the Congress of the United States, a financial message, please knock off this embarrassing rhetoric and stop responding to terrorism in a weak way. It is so unlike all the rest of your career. You're a fighter pilot; act like one. You sat next to President Sadat, your friend and mentor, as his blood was splattered on you by terrorist bullets. You survived by God's will alone. You took care of those killers permanently and avenged your President. Why so weak now? Stop widening this gap between our two countries. Let us stay together again in friendship, furthering peace in the Mideast. Do not let this terrorist hijacking of a pleasure ship succeed by damaging our good relations. Get real, Mr. President. Remember October 6, 1981.

EL SALVADORAN REFUGEES

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as a parent, my heart ached as I watched El Salvador's President Duarte send his children thousands of miles away to our country for protection. President Duarte and the people of his country have endured so much that this seems blatantly unfair.

As a Congresswoman, I am also angry that the same administration that would receive President Duarte's children for protection would continue to press criminal charges against American church people engaged in the sanctuary movement who are trying to protect other El Salvadoran refugees.

I hope, with all my heart, that this administration rethinks its position and stops prosecuting American citizens who are trying to aid refugees from El Salvador. When we admit the children of the President of that country, saying they cannot be protected, how can we possibly say that regular citizens can be safe? I also hope that this House moves as rapidly as it can on the Moakley bill, because that will help solve the problem.

□ 1240

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL POLICY

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was pleased to have attended an excellent dinner-seminar held by the House Wednesday Group which I currently chair. The event was titled "The Role of Government in Economic and Social Policy" and proved to be a superb opportunity to have an informal exchange of ideas between Members of Congress and members of the business and academic communities.

The evening was highlighted by remarks from our colleague BILL GRADISON, Brad Butler, chairman of Procter & Gamble, and David Saxon, president of MIT. Following short informal presentations, we also heard from Paul Volcker, Martin Feldstein, Charles Schultze, Paul McCracken, and a variety of other outstanding individuals.

Not surprisingly, although we sought to explain specific policy questions in education, civil rights, and a range of other important topics, the bulk of our discussion kept coming back to the Federal budget deficit, its macro and micro effects, and the inability of our national political institutions to deal effectively with it.

We learned from our guests, Mr. Speaker, that the budget deficit is the fundamental problem behind our trade deficit and unbalanced economic recovery. We cannot continue to avoid the tough choices that come with running a government. At the same time, our guests learned from us that while government never quite moves fast enough to address all our problems, our approach to the deficit has changed substantially in recent years. We may not have done enough but at least we are moving in the right direction.

SUPPORT URGED FOR THE JCS REORGANIZATION ACT

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, since 1982, the House Armed Services Investigation Subcommittee has looked long and hard into ways to improve the workings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. David Jones, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. Shy Meyer, the Army Chief of Staff, triggered this effort in 1982. Both generals in articles described the poor advice and even poorer staff procedures on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

After a series of very thorough hearings, the House passed JCS bills in 1982 and again in 1983 with broad, bipartisan support. On both occasions, the Senate was unable to draft its own Joint Chiefs of Staff bill. This year, the House Armed Services Investigation Subcommittee has again put together another JCS bill. This session, however, the chances are very good that the Senate will address this important matter.

Over the past 2 weeks, two highly respected Members of the other body have given a series of speeches about the very serious problems in the orga-

nization of our national defense establishment. I commend them for their efforts. Having worked on this issue since 1982, I am pleased about the bright prospect of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reform becoming a reality. I hope that the Members here will support the JCS Reorganization Act of 1985 that was recently adopted by the House Armed Services Investigation Subcommittee.

HIGH TECHNOLOGY MONTH

(Mr. LEWIS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the technology that is developed in this country is one of our most important national assets and affects nearly every facet of our lives.

Our homes are filled with the wonders of high technology making our lives richer and more comfortable.

The technological advances in the medical profession have increased the length and quality of our lives.

Space and ground communication systems have drawn the world community closer together thereby changing, for the better, our concepts of the world.

Technology has produced an unparalleled national defense capability and is a major factor in providing the proper climate for resumption of arms control talks.

Our developing high technologies also provide for our significant international competitive edge, producing both jobs and products.

The high return on our national investments in research and technology continues to be one of the best bargains available and I ask my colleagues to join with me this month, National High Technology Month, in recognizing and saluting the Nation's aspirations and achievements in the various and far-reaching fields of high technology.

CUT OFF AID TO EGYPT

(Mr. DARDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, Egypt's freeing of the hijackers of the *Achille Lauro*—who killed an American passenger—and its condemnation of our entirely justifiable operation to bring those outlaws to justice, should prompt reassessment of our aid program to Cairo.

When Anwar Sadat made peace with Israel under the Camp David accords, the United States swiftly rewarded Egypt. Economic and military aid was only $21 million in 1974—today it totals almost $2½ billion.

Now, President Mubarak, after giving misleading statements about the location of these hijackers, insinuates that our interception of the criminals, whom he allowed to escape, is an act of piracy. And he has the gall to demand an apology from us.

We supported President Sadat for an act of peace by greatly increasing assistance to Egypt. President Mubarak's tolerance of terrorism warrants an inverse response—a cutoff of that aid.

THE PEOPLE WANT ACTION ON THE DEFICIT NOW

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district want action on the deficit—and they want that action now.

While I was at home this last weekend, I stopped at a service station in Sunsites—the rural part of my district—to fix a leaky radiator hose. While the mechanic struggled under the hood of our car, he took the chance to tell me what he thought about our spending habits back here: "If you guys don't do something about that deficit, and stop all that spending," he told me, poking a greasy finger in my chest, "I'm not going to have this service station or any job * * * and you'll darn well be out of a job, too!"

You know, Mr. Speaker, he's right. And you know something else? The people of America have caught on to what we are doing back here. They've figured out that we can't have it both ways: voting for so-called "tough" budget resolutions to cut spending, and then voting for spending bills that waive the budget resolution.

Who are we kidding? Not the American people.

We need the Gramm-Rudman amendment to impose some discipline on us and on this budget process. Not next year. Not next month. We need it now.

RETAIN THE FULL DEDUCTIBILITY OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

(Mr. MANTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, tax reform will be successful only if it increases fairness and reduces the tax burden for middle America. This should be the test for any tax reform proposal. A major component of President Reagan's tax plan falls far short of meeting this test. That, of course, is the President's proposal to eliminate the deductibility of State and local taxes.

The State and local deduction has been a part of the Federal Tax Code since its creation in 1913. It is designed to prevent double taxation and to preserve the historic right of local governments to raise revenues.

A majority of middle-income taxpayers deduct their State and local taxes. In New York, the administration's proposal to end deductibility would add more than $1,600 to the tax bill of the average middle-income taxpayer.

Furthermore, ending deductibility would have a devastating effect on the ability of State and local governments to provide basic services. Education, police and fire, aid to the poor and elderly, health programs, all would suffer.

This proposal is even worse because it comes at a time when State governments are being forced to bear a greater responsibility for public services.

Finally, eliminating the State and local deduction would erode property values and dramatically increase the cost of home ownership.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to make certain tax reform fair and equitable, the full deductibility of State and local taxes must be maintained.

FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION URGED FOR BUY AMERICAN PROVISIONS IN H.R. 2959

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to weigh several factors when they consider funding for the Bonneville Power Administration. Last month, Westinghouse announced it will no longer make large power circuit breakers. If access to foreign markets were consistent with access to U.S. markets, Westinghouse would still be making circuit breakers.

They will now be made abroad; another example of exporting not products but jobs. Twelve hundred jobs. The 1979 trade agreements did not incorporate Government procurement of heavy electrical equipment and our trading partners have taken advantage of this by selling here while U.S. manufacturers have been excluded over there.

In the last 5 years, foreign penetration in the U.S. market has gone from 15 to 95 percent. There is no reciprocity. Yet in the last 4 years, over 80 percent of the items purchased by Bonneville Power Administration and funded in large part by American taxpayers have been for foreign-made equipment. Why? These are American taxpayers' dollars. We, the Congress, are the trustees for that money. In good conscience, we must make certain

American taxpayers' money is spent to insure American jobs.

Please consider favorably the buy American provisions in H.R. 2959.

□ 1250

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS SUPPORT STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

(Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington, DC, is generally regarded as the news capital of the world, but, surprisingly, with respect to a very historic event that took place yesterday in the city of San Francisco, I have not seen that event reported anywhere since it took place. That event was a convening of the North Atlantic Assembly made up of parliamentary representatives from the 16 NATO countries who, after a 3-day discussion of the issue and after listening to outstanding and very informative speeches by Secretary Shultz and Ambassador Nitze, voted overwhelmingly to support the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan.

In fact, that voting margin was 4 to 1 when the votes were counted by our NATO allies, and I think that is an outstanding and surprising success for the SDI.

This remarkable result, Mr. Speaker, was made possible by the tireless efforts of the leaders of our North Atlantic Assembly House delegation, the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. BROOKS, a former President of the Assembly, and the chairman of the House delegation, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL, the chairman of the great House committee on Foreign Affairs. Both of these leaders worked tirelessly with the delegations from Europe and Canada to convince them of the wisdom of the SDI.

I might also point out that both of these leaders who made this important victory possible for the Reagan administration were both Democrats. In that great legislative body, there was no partisanship; we worked as a team.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3520

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3520.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit at 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 17, 1985, for the purpose of holding a hearing on H.R. 277—a bill to amend the laws on limitation of a shipowner's liability—and on chapter 311 of H.R. 3156 pertaining to limitation of liability.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] have been apprised of the hearing date and time and are in accord with this request.

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

There was no objection.

LET'S ADD A LOTTERY TO THE DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks, the House and Senate have passed separate plans with one common goal—to eliminate the Federal deficit by 1991. Both plans would do this mostly through spending cuts with no new sources of revenue.

That does not have to be the only way. I have a modest proposal for the House-Senate conferees that would make the final deficit reduction plan less painful. Simply provide authority to conduct a national lottery in any of the 6 years of the plan. What a painless but potentially powerful source of new revenues.

States have a successful track record with lotteries. In 1983, revenues from 18 State lotteries exceeded $5.2 billion. Consider that in New York, in the week before the $40 million lottery award, tickets were selling at a rate of 20,000 a minute. Consider that our Nation's newest lottery in California saw 30 million tickets sold in just the first 2 days of operation.

Conservative estimates show a national lottery could raise between $12 and $18 billion a year depending on participation. The goal of the deficit reduction plan is $36 billion in savings a year. This means a national lottery could represent between one-third and one-half of these savings.

As the author of a national lottery bill, I urge it be given consideration. Its time has come.

SANDINISTA REPRESSION AGAINST THE NICARAGUAN PEOPLE INCREASES

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, from the inception of their regime, the Sandinistas have made no pretense of being anything other than committed Marxist-Leninists. Since coming to power in 1979, they have not deviated from establishing a totalitarian society against the wishes of the Nicaraguan people. We see increasing evidence of this repression in reports from Managua.

Now the ruling-junta has suspended civil liberties for 1 year, reducing the already restricted freedoms of the Nicaraguan people. And, in true Communist fashion, they shut down the Catholic Church newspaper, Iglesia, and intimidated its employees.

The Sandinistas claim this action was in response to the U.S. threat against Nicaragua. But this is the same excuse we've heard since they marched into Managua.

These recent measures aren't a result of U.S. actions; rather they're just part of the standard methods of Communist consolidation.

The threat, Mr. Speaker, to Nicaragua is not from the United States, but from the Nicaraguan Government. It is they who are oppressing their people. These latest Sandinista actions should be seen for what they really are—proof that the Communist in Managua are becoming more desperate, and their policies bankrupt.

ELIMINATING STATE AND LOCAL TAX REDUCTION IS BOTH UNPOPULAR AND UNFAIR

(Mr. MAVROULES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the proposal to eliminate the deduction for State and local taxes.

Eliminating this deduction would constitute double taxation for millions of hard-working middle-income taxpayers.

Must the middle class be asked to take on an even greater share of the financial burden of this country? Of my constituents responding to a recent survey I conducted, 82.4 percent say no.

Across the Nation an estimated 70 to 80 percent of all taxpayers, again, say no. This figure includes over 60 percent of those from low-tax States, as well as nonitemizers. Eliminating the State and local tax deduction is not only unpopular, it is unfair.

I urge my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to preserve the State and local tax deductions. Let us not add to the existing tax burden of the middle class who is more than contributing its fair share.

DEFICIT REDUCTION ISSUE NEEDS MORE ACTION, LESS TALK

(Mr. MONSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, a weekend visit to my district does not go by without hearing the question: "When are you going to do something about the deficit?"

Given the rhetoric that we hear almost daily in these Chambers, one would get the impression that that action is imminent, but last Friday, when given an opportunity to do something specific about reducing our national deficit, we passed the issue off again and sent it to conference so we could talk about it some more. That is somewhat consistent with the action we traditionally take of waiving budget resolution requirements and of voting to increase spending on appropriation bills.

The facts are that we are not dealing with this issue. The people of America want it dealt with, and they want it dealt with now. We have an opportunity to do it through a specific proposal that sets targets and gives discipline to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will quit talking and get on with the action that is necessary.

AMERICA'S ALLIES OFFER SCANT SUPPORT OF ANTITERRORISM EFFORTS

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, as the *Achille Lauro* drama continues to unfold, we are basking in the glory of finally having done something against terrorists.

But unfortunately, relations with some of our allies have hit rock bottom over this incident. President Mubarak of Egypt lied to the press and personally lied to the American Government. Italy allowed a known terrorist and murderer to quietly leave their country after United States warrants had been issued for his arrest.

These actions are a damning indictment of the commitment of our allies to support us and stand firm in the face of terrorism. It also questions the very substance of our relationships with these nations and the continued wisdom of pouring billions of U.S. aid dollars from American taxpayers into foreign coffers.

Mr. Speaker, one daring intercept does not an antiterrorist policy make. Clearly these events have shown us that a coordinated, formal policy of combating terrorism must be formulated and ratified by the United States and its allies.

We must learn to work together and depend on each other to lick this international menace.

A WRONG APPROACH TO SOLVING THE DEFICIT PROBLEM

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear about the deficit problem and what is being done. First of all, it is obvious to all of us and to all Americans that we have a serious problem with this Federal deficit.

□ 1300

We are now in conference with the Senate to try to resolve it. Two things ought to come from that, in my judgment. No. 1, we ought to require this President, who continually talks about balanced budgets, to send balanced budgets to Congress; and No. 2, we ought to require Congress to balance the Federal budget.

Now there were two things wrong that came from this missive that came from the other body. First, they say, "Let's do all of these things, but we want to wait until after the next election to get it done."

I say that is baloney. Let us roll up our sleeves and get it done. You want to do it, let us do it now. Let us not wait until after the next election.

And second, they say, "We want a little escape hatch here for this fiscal year leading up to the election. We might want to spend $20 billion more in this fiscal year."

So let us be clear about what is going on. We want to solve this deficit problem. I want this President to be required to submit balanced budgets to Congress, and I want this Congress to be required to balance the Federal budget at some point in the future.

But what came from the other body does not make sense at all for those two reasons. First, it does not take effect until after the next election; and second, in my judgment, it is not the right kind of medicine to solve this kind of problem and it would allow for more spending in the first fiscal year.

A WIDE RANGE OF CIVIL RIGHTS SUSPENDED IN NICARAGUA

(Mr. LUNGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, as other Members have already mentioned, President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua suspended yesterday a wide range of civil rights in his country. These rights include the right to public meetings, the right to strike, the right to freedom of expression, the right to move about freely within the country, and the right to organize into labor groups.

To make sure everybody understood he was serious, he sent people in, security agents of his Government, to the offices of the Roman Catholic Church's printing press to prevent the publication of a new magazine.

So maybe we ought to pay attention to his words and his actions and understand what he is doing. He is doing what many of us have warned about for some period of time. He is making sure that they entrench their Marxist-Leninist government in Nicaragua.

Just before the so-called elections in Nicaragua last year, he suspended the suspension of these civil rights for a short time in a showing of good faith; that is to try to dupe us into believing that those were free elections.

The folks who were down there, the folks who were elements of the other parties, refused to participate in the elections because they said they were not given an opportunity to freely participate. And some in this country suggested that those people were being less than forthcoming and, in fact, those elections were fairly free.

Let us just look at the record now. I think it is fairly clear what Daniel Ortega and his compatriots are doing down there. They are making sure that they are entrenched. They are violating civil liberties, and now they are doing it openly and efficiently. Let us take them at their word and take them at their actions.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1985

(Mr. CARPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, in 1985, almost 1,000 American banks are being maintained on a list of troubled institutions. Approximately 100 banks will fail this year in our country. Despite a return of profitability by a number of savings institutions, the situation in the savings industry is even more ominous, posing a threat to the vitality of the FSLIC which insures deposits in savings and loan institutions. Today, there are fewer than 4,000 remaining S&L's in America, as 1,000 of them have been liquidated and merged in the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing, along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE], legislation that will represent a major step forward in our attempt to ensure the safety and soundness of our financial institutions—banks, thrifts, and credit unions. I am pleased to be able to tell you that the bill is being introduced with over half of the members of the House Banking Committee as original cosponsors.

As our financial institutions have become more complex in their products and services, State and Federal examiners are being overwhelmed by their ever-growing responsibility for supervising these institutions. Low pay for examiners has led to high turnover rates and the loss of experience on the job. Without an experienced pool of expert examiners, early detection of risk in financial institutions is difficult. There is no question that identifying problems sooner is one of the keys to lowering the number of bank and thrift failures.

This legislation grew out of hearings conducted by the Banking Committee over the past year and meetings Congressman LUNDINE and I have held with representatives from the financial industry and the regulatory agencies. Many suggestions have evolved from these discussions, ranging from risk-based premiums and risk-based capital to market-based accounting. However, there was no consensus on any of these proposals. During this lengthy process, many witnesses did testify to the importance of improving the compensation and training of examiners as a fundamental first step, regardless of what other changes may be made.

Briefly, my bill would authorize the development of a reasonable system of compensation for all Federal examiners. Additionally, the bill provides for better training of these examiners, and it authorizes a graduate degree program in financial management analysis. Finally, the legislation would require the establishment of a uniform procedure for reviewing, with the consent of the States, State examinations of institutions which are also subject to examinations by Federal agencies.

I hope that these steps will help provide Federal and State examiners of financial institutions with the expertise to identify problem institutions sooner—restoring confidence in our banks, thrifts, and credit unions. It is a logical first step toward enhancing the safety and soundness of our financial system.

COSPONSORS INVITED FOR LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF BANK EXAMINATION

(Mr. LUNDINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware, for this cooperative effort with respect to improving the quality of bank examinations and I take pride in being a cosponsor of that legislation.

I am also today introducing legislation requiring the President to call an international conference to reform the monetary exchange system in this country and in relation to other currencies around the world.

We all know that the overvalued, inflated dollar, is a major aspect of our international trade problem. Various economists have tried to quantify it, some saying that it is as much as 70 percent of our trade deficit problem.

Now, what can we do about the overvalued dollar? Last week I joined our colleague in the other body, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BRADLEY, in cosponsoring a strategic capital reserve designed to intervene on a strategic basis in capital markets to bring the value of the dollar into line.

Today I am introducing a long-term program to bring monetary reform to international exchange and I invite the attention of the House and the cosponsorship of my colleagues for this legislation.

BLACK CAUCUS BUDGET WOULD HAVE REDUCED DEFICIT

(Mr. DELLUMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment to comment on this issue of the budget deficit. There has been a great deal of discussion with respect to the need for Members of the House of Representatives to in effect bite the bullet or make the difficult decisions to govern this country and simultaneously bring down the budget deficit.

I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, that the 20 Members of the House who make up the Congressional Black Caucus did just that. We submitted a national budget for all of America and in so doing we brought down the budget deficit over the out years more efficiently and more effectively and more drastically than any other budget submitted to the Congress of the United States and we did so for 5 consecutive years.

In effect, we did bite the bullet. We did make the difficult political decision that we were prepared to defend politically, intellectually, ethically, as well as morally.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that embracing the Gramm-Rudman formula that would bring down the deficit by 1991 is really a flight into fantasy. It really does not require the Members of the House to bite the bullet. As a matter of fact, it takes us off the hook. We tend to cling tenaciously to the magic carpet ride or a new formula that would not require that we make difficult decisions.

We embraced the nuclear freeze. We did not have to make decisions about bringing down the incredibly dangerous levels of nuclear weapons.

We had an across-the-board freeze cut so that we would not have to make difficult decisions that we would have to stand up and defend intellectually, politically, as well as morally.

Now we have a new formula, the Gramm-Rudman formula, which does not require us to make difficult decisions. We just hurt people across the board. I think it is inappropriate, Mr. Speaker.

AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DEFICIT

(Mr. LOWRY of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for the statement he just made. I am proud of the fact that for 5 years I voted for the Black Caucus budget, which did make the tough choices.

Nothing is better to show what a political sham the missioe that came over from the other side is than the fact that the day after they voted, 75 to 25, for the Gramm-Rudman, they voted overwhelmingly against cutting the defense budget, voted overwhelmingly against cutting Social Security, voted overwhelmingly against raising taxes. They voted overwhelmingly against the only really tough things which will do something about this budget deficit.

It is obvious that Gramm-Rudman is a way by which to get 33 Senators past the next election and avoid the tough votes. It is a political sham. We ought to throw it aside and come up with a real deficit reduction plan.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF RADIATION CONTROL FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, October 16, 1985.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 196 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. 1409.

□ 1310

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. 1409) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, with Mr. GLICKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, today the Committee on Armed Services, the Subcommittee on Military Facilities and Military Installations, brings to the floor of this body H.R. 1409, as amended, the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill.

In presenting this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER], the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, for his leadership and assistance during extensive hearings on the bill before the body today.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would hasten to indicate that I would like very much to thank all the other members of the subcommittee for their extraordinary diligence on this bill, particularly at a time when we face severe budgetary constraints and difficult choices.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that H.R. 1409, as amended, is a good bill. It represents a balanced effort that sought to meet both the fiscal constraints that face us and to respond to the most pressing construction requirements of the military services.

For the benefit of the Members, Mr. Chairman, I would briefly review the development of this legislation. The purpose of the bill is to provide new military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military department, defense agencies, Guard and Reserve forces. Its enactment is necessary before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense originally requested new authorization in the amount of $10.3 billion for fiscal year 1986. On May 14, by vote of 43 to 1, the Committee on Armed Services approved the bill before us, H.R. 1409, as amended, providing for $9.55 billion in authorization for the new fiscal year. This amount is $759 million below the administration's budget request.

The full committee action on H.R. 1409, as amended, followed extensive hearings and review by the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities. In order to be consistent with the expected final form of the first concurrent budget resolution, the committee adopted certain procedures as outlined in the committee report for reducing the budget request. These procedures resulted in a number of reductions being made and some projects being deferred that may otherwise be considered valid requirements.

In the interest of time, Mr. Chairman, I would not detail some of the individual actions taken by the committee. For your convenience, however, I have included in my statement a summary of those actions which are more fully explained in the committee report.

[In thousands of dollars]

Military department	Fiscal year 1986 budget request	Committee changes	Total approved by committee
Army	$3,649,674	−$250,263	$3,399,441
Navy	2,886,249	−284,015	2,602,234
Air Force	2,917,048	−107,487	2,809,561
Defense agencies	329,900	−124,140	205,760
NATO	98,000	−43,000	55,000
Guard and Reserves	428,600	+49,963	478,563
Totals	10,309,471	−758,942	9,550,529

But just to review, the fiscal year 1986 budget request from the administration was a figure of $10.3 billion. The committee then cut $758.9 million, for a total authority of $9.55 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to fully explain to my colleagues that the military construction authorization bill, although coming to the floor as a separate piece of legislation—and I would just add parenthetically that I think perhaps the only reason why the military construction budget comes to the floor as a separate item is simply because of the enormous number of individual contracts that are involved in the bill; and second, perhaps simply out of convenience and out of tradition; but this gentleman who chairs the subcommittee is seriously considering next year bringing the military construction budget as part of the total military authorization bill so that my colleagues will not become confused with respect to the notion that in some way the military construction budget indeed stands separate and apart from the total military authorization bill. Nothing can be further from the truth.

□ 1315

So that if we brought the bill in total, it would simply be another title of the military authorization bill, and the Chair thinks that next year that it probably would be more appropriate to do so, so that our colleagues can look at our military requirements in their aggregate, in effect embracing the Gestalt, rather than dealing with this particular bill as a separate item.

But to go further, as will be recalled, Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the first concurrent resolution on the budget, in the wisdom of this body they decided that the military budget for fiscal year 1986 would be frozen at last year's authorization levels. We agreed to that in the budget resolution. So we meant that the ceiling for the military budget of fiscal year 1986 would be $292 billion.

As a result of that budget debate and that budget decision that took place on the floor of this House, that was communicated to the Committee on Armed Services: That although the President of the United States had asked in the aggregate for a military budget approximately $322 billion in total, that the House of Representatives had given the Committee on Armed Services a maximum figure of $292 billion, which represented the authorization of last year so that we, in effect, froze it at 1985 levels.

The leadership of the House Committee on Armed Services, both Democrat and Republican, sat down and said, "We now are faced with a $292 billion figure. How do we then shift the priorities within that $292 billion figure?"

My colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services decided that if they had to cut down to a freeze level, $292 billion, that they wanted the heaviest cuts to come from procurement and research and development; that those two areas that over the last several years made a rather dramatic increase, that those two categories of the military budget should take the largest cuts, therefore providing that the No. 1 constructive priority would be in readiness and in quality of life.

Mr. Chairman, as most of my colleagues know, readiness and quality of life over the years has not been the highest of priorities. In this body we tended to be more preoccupied with the technology, with sophisticated weapons systems, but with not as much consideration for the human dimension of the military, where people work, how they live, how they function.

There are 2.1 million men and women serving in the U.S. military. So in the wisdom of my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services, attempting to respond favorably to the first concurrent resolution on the budget, dealing with the budget for fiscal year 1986, decided that within that $292 billion figure that the Subcommittee on Military Facilities and Installations that this gentleman chairs, responsible for bringing a military construction budget to the floor, that we would take a lower cut, so they allocated cuts across the board to each subcommittee, and that those cuts would in the aggregate total $292 billion and not exceed it.

In that formula, this subcommittee was given a figure of $718 million to cut, and they said:

You guys deal with the issues of quality of life, family housing, et cetera. So you will take a cut of a minimum of $718 million.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the subcommittee took that responsibility very diligently and, as a matter of fact, not only did we reach the $718 million figure, we exceeded it. So we went to $759 million. So the President's request was at $10.3 billion. We then, given our allocation within the $292 billion, $718 million to stay within the freeze figure, exceeded that by a few million dollars, to $759 million.

I go into this elaborate explanation because there are some of my colleagues who have an unfortunate and misguided view, and that is that the military construction budget is indeed a separate piece of legislation because it tends to come to the floor separately, but it is not. The leadership of the Committee on Armed Services, carrying out its responsibilities beautifully, attempted to establish priorities and they said for the first time that quality of life will be a high priority issue.

So that means we came to the floor with a figure of $9.55 billion. Last year's authorization was at $9.1 billion. If one did not know, one would say, "Well, is this $450 million over and above last year's authorization? Does that take us beyond the freeze?"

The answer to that is no; that the figure that we brought to the floor of $9.55 billion is within the $292 billion freeze figure, simply allocated based upon priorities.

The Chair would like to point out one further thing with respect to these numbers. At some point one of our colleagues, or some of our colleagues, will offer an amendment to freeze back at appropriation levels. There are arguments that I will raise at that time, but I want to notify my colleagues that at the appropriate point we will offer a substitute amendment that would bring the authorization, notwithstanding any action we take on the floor of this body, that we would not authorize beyond $9.2 billion.

Let me explain where we get the $9.2 billion; $9.55 billion was within the $292 billion freeze level. As my colleagues know, we went to conference with the Senate and my colleagues decided that they would acquiesce to the Senate's figure of $302 billion. This was a decision that this gentleman did not agree with, and on the record opposed that decision. But the majority will was there and we came back from conference with a figure of $302 billion.

One would assume logically that if we came back with a larger figure, $10 billion over the freeze level, that the military construction budget would then have a higher figure. The interesting thing is that once the smoke settled and we realized all the deals that were made in the conference, the figure that was assumed in the $302 billion conference report actually was lower. It brought us down to $9.2 billion. The practical effect is that our budget was, in effect, cut prior to the time that we bring the authorization bill.

So the chairman believes that in carrying out the dutiful responsibilities of this subcommittee that we then have a responsibility to make this authorization bill conform to the conference report, even though it means a lower figure. So we will now be reducing, at the appropriate point in the proceeding this afternoon, from $9.55 billion and whatever add-ons we accept on the floor, back down to $9.2 billion maximum authorization, bringing us not only in compliance with the conference report, but several hundred million dollars under what was our responsibility under the $292 billion.

So the Chair would like to, in explaining this in some detail, Mr. Chairman, point out that this committee is clearly hundreds of millions of dollars within the freeze figure.

I might just add one other note parenthetically, Mr. Chairman. The figure that this body authorized for military construction last year was at $9.1 billion, I believe, so the $9.2 billion is only a few dollars over and above the authorization level. If we then go to conference at $9.2 billion, the Chair believes without fear of contradiction that this committee will more than likely come back probably with a figure even lower than the $9.2 billion, but that remains to be seen, given the comity between this body and the other body as we go to conference.

So I took that time to explain this in some detail. Just further and briefly, Mr. Chairman, because of the decision of establishing quality of life as the high priority of military construction, we were able to bring to the floor today a military construction bill with over 5,500 units of family housing, barracks, maintenance facilities to improve the living and working conditions of our men and women in uniform.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that some of us traveled to different military installations in this country and overseas as well. What we have come to realize is that the American military is rapidly becoming a married military, Mr. Chairman. A very high percentage of our military personnel are married people. That, then, means that we have to engage in certain kinds of policy decisions. How will these people live? We make a number of policies on the floor of this body that affect human beings in the military in very profound and dramatic ways. We have decided to have thousands of troops stationed in Europe. This gentleman has gotten up on the floor on numerous occasions and argued against that deployment, but the majority of my colleagues have seen fit to deploy. So if we deploy, we go overseas and ask these young people who are living on the economy, "How are you surviving?" We suddenly find out that many of them are subsidizing their service in the military, that their housing allowance is not adequate, that many of them live far away from the military base. They have to put a phone in and it comes out of their pocket. They have to purchase an automobile that they cannot afford. They are married. They have one, two, or three children.

□ 1325

I talked to young American military personnel in Germany who said, "I am not being given any dignity, Mr. Chairman, I am not living in dignity. If I were living in the United States, I would live better than this."

We talked to troops in the United States who cannot quite make it on their allowances, and so we have to address the human reality. We have to address the problems that are all too real among the people.

I might just point out the very dramatic case that took place at Fort Ord when a young child, a member of a military family, chose to take his life, to commit suicide because he felt that if his family did not have him to feed, one less mouth to feed, that that family could survive.

Consider the enormous and frightening and painful implications of having people in the military and we do not take care of the quality of their lives adequately.

I would argue that we ought to be dealing with the human misery of all people in this country, all people. I happen in this particular instance to have come to the floor dealing with the problems of young men and young women who serve in the military. So we tried to take this responsibility, Mr. Chairman, very seriously. And we expanded family housing. We tried to

bring in child care facilities, community service facilities, other kinds of facilities that are very real.

We talked to military commanders who said there was a time in my military career when I only had to deal with the tactical and strategic issues, but now I have to deal with the problems of marriage, the psychological problems, the problems of taking care of children, because I know that if a military person serving somewhere away from home is worrying about their children, worrying about their spouse back home, that 100 percent of their emotional, and intellectual, and psychological resources are not where they are because they are back home worrying. So our military commanders now realize that child care centers are not some frivolous addition, that family housing is not a frivolous addition, that community centers that serve people and serve married personnel in the military are not frivolous issues.

I would say to my colleagues, you have to put up or shut up. If you make the decision to deploy these troops, you have to deal with them in dignity.

People say, "Gee, is this RON DELLUMS, the progressive from Berkeley, making these kinds of statements? This is the guy that comes to the floor that challenges the military budget." But my response to that is we are not knee-jerk people, we are not saying, and we do not come here to say, that we are antimilitary.

What we are challenging are the specific roles we have the military playing, specific missions and policies that we have them carrying out, that one can intellectually debate, politically differ with, and we also oppose certain weapons that we place in the military's hands that we believe ultimately will bring devastation and destruction to the world.

So this notion are you promilitary or antimilitary, that is really a non sequitur. What we have to do is address the realities we are confronted with, and military construction is dragged by other kinds of decisions.

If you choose to build that B-1, you are going to have to construct landing pads. If you choose to build the MX, you are going to have to engage in construction around it. If you choose to deploy the Euromissile, you have to build support facilities. If you choose to forwardly deploy American troops in different places around the world, you have to take care of where they work, and where they live, and provide them with some dignity, some respect, and some sense of integrity.

So you have to look at the totality of the decisions that are made.

So this gentleman finds himself in a position of saying we must enhance the quality of life. I would like to see us do it for all people. In this instance, we are talking about the military, and we have to do it that way.

My colleagues on the Armed Services Committee with whom I often disagree strongly, we agree on enhancing the quality of life.

I pointed out earlier, and will go into it, on a vote of 43 to 1, the bill passed out. This gentleman was the one opposing vote. So they said how can you bring a bill to the floor and oppose it.

It is not that we did not do good work, and I commend everybody on the committee for doing extraordinary work in making the issue of quality of life a much more magnificent effort on our part. And so that is a good piece of this bill. But we cannot vote on that separate, it is a total bill.

My opposition was not a slap in the face of the work of my colleagues, because they worked diligently, and with honesty, and with integrity. What my opposition was is to simply say that this budget reflects the general bill. The decisions that are made in the big bill drag along this bill.

So where we had discretion; that is, quality of life, we exercised it. Where we did not have discretion, this bill conforms to the larger military authorization bill for fiscal year 1986.

So those persons, Mr. Chairman, who supported the military authorization bill, they can support this bill and there are probably reasons why they can be even more enthusiastic because there are a number of benign, quality-of-life projects that do not kill anyone, but do enhance the dignity of the human condition. Those persons who opposed the bill on policy and on principle, you still can oppose the bill, not because there are not good items in this legislation, but it embraces policies that are consistent with the other bill. I will go into that later.

Let me just in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, give a few highlights of what the committee did in terms of some of the dollar items. Briefly I will highlight some of the major adjustments made by the committee, and then reserve time.

A $22.7 million reduction in the Ground-Launched Cruise Missile Program. The decrease reflects the committee's action to defer $22.7 million for supporting facilities in the Netherlands until the country-to-country agreement has been finalized.

A $19.2 million reduction for construction in Spain. Renewal of the base rights agreement is in question due to the Spanish Government's recent restated desire to reduce U.S. forces in Spain.

A $39 million reduction for a binary component production facility. The cost estimate is questionable because it is based on zero design.

A $19.5 million reduction for controlled humidity warehouses in Korea. The committee questioned the scope and the cost and directed the Army to consider less expensive construction methods.

A $148 million reduction for a water reclamation and flood control project at Camp Pendleton, CA. For the second time, the committee deferred the Navy's share of the proposed $270 million project until the scope is resolved and independent action is taken by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

A $20.5 million reduction for airfield improvements in Keflavik, Iceland. The deferral of this project reflects committee concern that Iceland should share the cost since improvements would mostly benefit the new civilian air terminal under construction.

A $21.5 million reduction for a fleet operational control center in Japan. The committee deferred the project and directed the Navy to reevaluate the scope and the cost.

Mr. Chairman, then $43 million reduction in NATO infrastructure funds to reflect the U.S. dollar's strength against other NATO currencies.

Finally, in the general provisions, the committee approved the following major items:

Provisions that would increase the number of affordable housing units available for service personnel both in the United States and overseas, and I have alluded to that.

A provision authorizing the services to use funds appropriated for planning and design purposes to assist communities in planning for a major military growth impact.

Three fair-market-value land exchanges and three land conveyances were authorized.

Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that this is a balanced bill, a bill that on the one hand reflects the consensus of this body with respect to the policies established in the larger bill. It reflects from a monetary perspective the commitment to freeze at last year's level that this body adopted. And finally, it also is a bill that attempted to expand the quality of life and enhance the living and working conditions of our young men and women who happen to serve in the military.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I would be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I just wanted to commend the gentleman from California for his activities in this bill. As I have already told him, I had the privilege during the recess period to visit Germany in the so-called quick-look arrangement that the Secretary of the Army favors. We visited in the course of 3 days most of the headquarters of American units in Germany, and we were particularly impressed with the

construction that is going on with the 3d Armored Division in Friedberg.

The thing that was most remarkable was that in place of the old German kasernes, where many of our troops are still housed, in place of that, they are building new structures that were dramatically much more attractive, much more comfortable, more spacious for our enlisted personnel. I asked the commanding general, are these new modern structures not something that the Congress has directed, that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has innovated to improve the quality of life? Yes indeed, the general said these are the designs that Congressman DELLUMS insisted on to provide more space and more light.

As we walked through these buildings—they are not yet complete but they are pretty well completed—you could see the pleasure on the faces of the young men and women that were serving there and they were looking forward to the day when they could move into these modern facilities.

So when the gentleman talks about the quality of life, "you ain't just whistling Dixie." You have really put these ideas into reality over there. I am sure the enlisted personnel will certainly give their congratulations to you for what you have done. I think that is what the gentleman was talking about in this bill about improving the quality of life and I think it is a very remarkable achievement.

I hope that the House will approve this legislation overwhelmingly.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague, and I was very pleased to yield to him. I would simply say that I appreciate the personal references. They are always obviously gratifying.

But I would hasten to add that all of my colleagues on the subcommittee agree with respect to making this a major priority. And whatever accolades are given out, I would like to share them with all of my colleagues, because that is an area where we have all come together. We have our political differences. That is very obvious in the 15 years I have been here. But the rewarding thing is on these matters we have managed to close ranks and we have come together to enhance the quality of life.

I thank my colleague and, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill that is before us this afternoon.

In that process, let me commend the members of the subcommittee and our staff for doing what I consider to be an excellent job. Let me especially commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], not only for his fair leadership, but also because of his, I think, farsightedness. I think he is far too modest in terms of his own role increating a new emphasis within the committee on quality-of-life issues.

Obviously the committee has for a long time been concerned that our military personnel around the world are well-housed and well cared for as an important ingredient in morale. But I think under his subcommittee chairmanship, more has been done quickly than certainly at any time that I have been privileged to be a member of this committee, and I think this body owes him a great debt of thanks for his efforts in this regard.

□ 1340

As the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] explained, this legislation represents an effort by the Committee on Armed Services to respond to the military services' most pressing construction needs and at the same time to do it within the fiscal constraints that face us.

Earlier, some of the major adjustments to this bill were explained, and I will not take the time of the Members of this body to reintroduce those subjects at this juncture.

Suffice it to say that the Department of Defense requested approximately $10.3 billion for fiscal year 1986 military construction. This represented some significant growth over the amount authorized by Congress for the 1985 fiscal year military construction program, and after a careful review of that request, this committee was able to reduce that number by $759 million; well within our overall objective of no real growth in the defense function.

The bottom line, I think, is as the gentleman aptly pointed out and must be remembered, is that this bill at its present funding level of $9.55 billion actually represents a figure that is $32 million below a freeze level compared to 1985 expenditures and authorizations.

I believe we were able to do this without damaging our defense readiness, without postponing badly needed projects to improve the facilities where our personnel live and work.

Even with the changes made by our committee, this bill provides a level of authorization that maintains the committee's propriety for quality of life projects. This means that besides providing facilities for new weapons systems, many substandard structures built during World War II can be replaced; modern barracks and working spaces will be provided for our forces at home and overseas, and programs to comply with environmental laws and for conserving energy will continue at an uninterrupted pace.

Although the committee has brought to the House a bill that entails a smaller total program than that requested by the administration, it preserves our defense readiness and in many instances improves our fighting capabilities.

I think this is a bill that the House can pass upon favorably, proudly, and I urge that this bill be passed by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER] has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] who is the ranking Democrat on the committee and a very diligent worker.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill. As the ranking majority member on the Subcommittee on Installations and Facilities, I would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DELLUMS, on the fine work he has accomplished in bringing this bill to the floor. With the cooperation of the ranking minority member, Mr. KRAMER, and the other members of the subcommittee and staff members most helpful, we were able to draft a bill which represents fiscal responsibility and, at the same time, provides the authorization levels required to fund the essential projects needed by our Active and Reserve Forces.

The total $9.6 billion figure in this bill reflects a reduction of some $700 million in the $10.3 billion amount requested by the administration. After extensive hearings and deliberations, the members of the Armed Service Committee considered the projects in the administration's request as well as requests for additional projects and made some very conscious decisions. However, I am particularly pleased to point out the emphasis placed on Guard and Reserve facilities, family housing, and other quality-of-life projects.

In arriving at its decisions, the committee felt that it was time to address the needs which have become so critical; needs such as family housing, antiquated barracks, and inadequate training and work areas. We cannot continue year after year to fund facilities for expensive weapons systems and let the needs of the men and women in uniform go unanswered.

Guard and Reserve military construction requirements also received particular attention by the committee. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, Congress has placed increasing emphasis on the Nation's Guard and Reserve Forces. This emphasis reflects, not only a desire to provide a first line of defense under the total force concept,

but also a desire to reduce defense expenditures. Reliance on our Reserve Forces has proven to be an effective means of achieving overall budget reductions.

Increased reliance, however, also requires increased support of these forces. The area of facilities is no exception. When the administration submitted its military construction request, I was dismayed to see that only 4.1 percent, or some $429 million, was intended to fund Reserve requirements. This was particularly alarming in light of the testimony we had heard indicating a backlog of more than $3 billion in Guard and Reserve construction projects.

I am pleased that this bill reflects action taken by the Armed Services Committee to help correct this Reserve and National Guard situation and make a dent in this backlog. I would hope that next year's request will reflect a more responsible evaluation on the part of the administration of Guard and Reserve requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides authorization for the essential military construction projects and also represents a responsible approach to resolving some very critical problems. I, therefore, ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill pending here, on the military construction for this year, and I would like to join with my colleagues from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER] in paying tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his diligence, his hard work, his fairness and accommodation anytime I have had to deal with him, and as far as I know any other member of the committee.

We have a good subcommittee; a very good subcommittee. We approach it with dedication; we approach it with the interest of the American taxpayer in mind, and I think that we—even patting myself on the back as a member of that subcommittee—I think we do a darn good job.

We scrubbed the figures that were given to us; we reduced them; and then when the Budget Committee gave us a figure, to the full committee; the senior members got together and they said, "Well, all right, this is the size of the pie that we have, how do we divide it up? Do we take a pro rata part and have everybody take a certain percent, or what do we do?"

It was a joint decision of the full Committee on Armed Services that one thing that we wanted to protect was the quality of life of our enlisted men as well as our officers, and the things that make it worthwhile to serve on the Committee on Armed Services.

So because of this, it was the agreement of the Research and Development Subcommittee, the Procurement Subcommittee, the Seapower Subcommittee, all the other subcommittees that whatever retrenchments that were made in the spending levels that we wanted to make sure that our servicemen at home and overseas had a dignity to their military existence; themselves, their families, that their quality of life was not minimized by the cuts that we might be faced with here on the floor.

We did this, and so as was pointed out by the chairman of the subcommittee, when we had to take the cuts, we took them in other areas, but this is a part of the total bill. So when the total bill is, as we will mandate it by our Budget Committee on the House side at least, we were given $292 billion as the total bill. Then we went to conference with the Senate, and we came up with $302 billion. We have yet to come back to the floor and get the conference report approved, but then the Appropriations Committee gets into the process.

□ 1350

It is my understanding now that they have reported out again a reduction back to $292 billion. Well, that is all right. Whatever works out between the House and the Senate.

But what we must do is to see that our equipment is under canopies, in storage. It is going to ruin if it stands out in the rain or in the weather. We have to see that our people are living in dignified conditions, and this is not the case universally. It is especially not the case in Europe. It has not been the case historically. We have been working very diligently on the committee to increase and to enhance the quality of life because, you see, it is very pennywise and pound foolish not to spend what is needed and to lose that man that we have had 4 years of training invested in, plus his transportation, or even 8 years. When he says, "Hey, I don't like it here any more, my family is not being adequately cared for, my children are not proud to be in the military, we are living in substandard conditions," then we lose him because we have not provided for him.

I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, and I am here to tell you that some of the exotic, far out research and development programs that we have tightened our belt and made substantial reductions in research and development. But when it gets to a question of buying new weapons, of getting into the SDI star wars, and all these "big buck" programs, and you compare that to getting the troops out of the rain, putting them in decent housing conditions, I really do not think there is any comparison. So we have tried to protect, in the total budget, what we need for our people in uniform. We have not been extravagant.

We have come up with a figure less than what was asked for by the administration. I think any amendment that might be offered to decrease what we have done will really be short-sighted because I think we can justify everything that is within this bill, and I would certainly urge the Members, so far as the military construction part of the total military bill, I would urge all the Members to support this. If they are unhappy with the total spending on the military, if they do not want to buy weapon systems, if they do not want to do research and development, fine, attack those when they come in another section of the bill. But not out of the military construction part of it.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to another very diligent and hard-working member of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia

Mr. SISISKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, most of the information that I was going to provide to the committee was already talked about.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee, chaired by the very able gentleman from California, held 2 weeks of hearings on this legislation. Our task was not an easy one, for we had to find ways to reduce the budget request and yet provide sufficient funds to field various new weapons, replace deteriorated World War II facilities at many bases, and provide better facilities where our military personnel live and work. I believe this bill accomplishes that goal.

We reduced the request by a net amount of $759 million by taking the following actions:

First, projects were disapproved when no clear requirement existed or because they failed to meet established construction design thresholds;

Second, project estimates were lowered wherever possible to reflect the currently favorable construction bidding climate, reduced inflation rates and favorable overseas dollar exchange rates; and

Third, available unobligated balances of prior-year authorization of appropriations were carried forward and applied wherever possible.

As a result of these actions, the committee was able to reduce the $10.3 billion request by $1 billion. At the same time, additional projects totaling approximately $250 million were included because of their relative priority in terms of contributing to

military readiness, morale, and operational capability.

We on the committee believe this is a good bill and deserves the support of the House. I urge its passage.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1409, and I salute the members of the committee who have already spoken concerning the importance of this piece of legislation. But in particular, I would like to embrace the comments made by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

As a matter of fact, he so accurately described the importance and the scenario of how we got here that it leaves very little to be said. As a matter of fact, I would like to say that, for anyone, a Member of this body, who was here and listened to what our chairman had to say, it would be beyond me how they could oppose this piece of legislation.

When we started back in February of this year to address how we were going to spend our military construction dollars, we were working up to a budget figure that was, for the whole committee, $30 billion below what the President requested for all DOD spending.

This gentleman, quite frankly, did not agree with those figures, but that is what we had to live with. When the chairman and the ranking members of all the committees got together, they parceled up and responsibly made a decision as to how they wanted to spend those dollars.

Under any scheme of things, whether you go with the figures that came out of our conference or whether you go with the figures that came out of this body, we are below any freeze figure as for as Milcon is concerned. The only people that could oppose this bill under that set of circumstances are people who do not understand what we are trying to do here.

Just to put things in perspective, that cut, that $30 billion reduction from what the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, requested, and of itself, is three times as big as the entire expenditure for military construction in this bill.

This total expenditure for military construction, for the quality of life for our troops, for their readiness, for the defense of this country amounts to just a little over 3 percent of the Department of Defense authorization bill.

If you have problems with defense expenditures, wait until that bill, the defense authorization bill, comes along. In the meantime, I think every Member ought to take into consideration what we are trying to do here is allocate some $9.2 billion, less than 3 percent of the total DOD budget, and I think we have acted very responsibly.

I would like to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California, and for the benefit of the other Members, that I have served on this committee now for 3 years. When we started marking up and having hearings early this year, it was quite a challenge for us, notwithstanding the fact that some of the bigger cuts have been allocated to other subcommittees. We had to look at situations where we have people living in uninhabitable premises and deny them improvements. Yet they are supposed to proudly wear the uniform of the U.S. Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps. When we had to make some pretty tough decisions and cut more and more, we did the right thing; we did it within the framework of the mark the subcommittee was given. When people come back and suggest that we were not responsible and did not allocate appropriately, I would suggest to them that if they have a problem with the size of the overall defense budget, wait until the other bill comes along. If you want to do something responsible, debate this bill and show us where we went wrong. The fact of the matter is, the chairman, the gentleman from California, has done an outstanding job. In all the time I have served in Government, I want to say that I have yet to serve with anyone who has been as fair, or more reasonable, and open to the Members when they wanted to come and plead their case.

So I say to the people who do not want to think about it but instead are a little concerned about the perception of what we are doing here in Washington, I would suggest you have missed an opportunity in the past to come before our subcommittee and find out where it is at. And I would suggest that if you had problems with the way we do our business, I know this chairman would welcome you to come before our subcommittee in the future and state specifically where you think we ought to beat up on the men and women in uniform in this country or upon the readiness of the defense of the United States of America.

So I salute the chairman for all the outstanding work he has done this year and in prior years, and, believe me, it is a privilege to serve on that subcommittee.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from California and the members of his subcommittee for the excellent work they have done in providing the military construction authorization in support of the missions of our active duty and reserve forces.

The needs and demands for construction projects far exceed the available funds. Thus, it required a careful review by Mr. DELLUMS and his subcommittee of the Department of Defense's budget submission to Congress and the concerns of individual Members before a final decision could be made as to which projects would be authorized.

Besides providing the construction required to support the weapon systems Congress has approved, the committee gave careful consideration to quality of life programs for our service men and women, and their dependents.

Further, the subcommittee was very supportive of projects that will improve our military readiness through the enhancement of our in-house maintenance and repair capabilities.

My own district, the Fourth Congressional District of California, is home to two major Air Force facilities: McClellan AFB and Travis AFB, and in the surrounding areas we have Mather AFB, Sacramento Army Depot, and Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Chairman DELLUMS and his subcommittee have been very supportive of these bases both this year and in years past.

In this bill, the following projects have been approved: McClellan AFB receives $16.9 million for an aircraft accessory maintenance complex, $3.5 million for an ammunition storage complex, $13.1 million for a depot electronic warfare communication facility, $10.3 million for a logistics systems operations center, $12.8 million for a medical and occupational health clinic, and $700,000 for sound suppressor support.

Additionally, $5.8 million is approved to hook up McClellan's wastewater disposal system to the Sacramento regional system.

The Sacramento Army Depot will receive $1.9 million to construct a communication repair facility, and $4.5 million to construct an optical facility.

Mather Air Force Base will receive $1.5 million to construct an accounting-finance facility and $1.2 million to construct a central life support equipment facility.

Travis Air Force Base will receive $78 million for phase III of the David Grant Memorial Hospital and medical complex. This 298-bed facility will include outpatient clinics, a 52-room dental clinic, an aeromedical staging facility, and a hyperbasic chamber. It will serve over 70,000 people.

Other projects approved by the committee for Travis include a $2 million addition to the flight simulator train-

ing facility, a $2.1 million facility for hazardous storage, and $6.2 million for a weapons systems maintenance support facility. Total funding for Travis construction projects amount $81.1 million.

Mare Island will receive $815,000 for security lighting and $5.1 million for a sewage treatment program.

Again, I applaud the gentleman from California and his subcommittee for their outstanding work and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the job of managing the military construction bill is one that embraces all of our military facilities. I want to say publicly that the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, is always open to listen to the literally thousands of requests that are made of him concerning the military installations in our country and around the world. And I want to say that the chairman has done an outstanding job.

I appreciate the time, the effort, the energy, and the intellect that the chairman has given to the subject over which he presides.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

For the purposes of entering into a colloquy, I yield at this time to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DELLUMS] if he could take a minute to discuss the very difficult Navy housing situation facing us in the San Francisco Bay area.

Currently, for Navy families in the bay area, we need about 1,000 units of housing beyond what is now available. Within a couple of years, the battleship *Missouri* and its escorts will be stationed in the bay, increasing the need for family housing to a total of 3,700 units by 1989.

Yet as you well know, the bay area is one of the most congested, expensive housing areas in the Nation. I think I can catch our colleagues' attention when I say it is even more expensive than housing in the Washington, DC, area!

There are very few open spaces suitable for masses of housing, but there is a large amount of housing that is suitable for rehabilitation and repair near some of the large naval facilities. Does the gentleman have any thoughts on how we can best meet the current shortfall in housing and prepare for the arrival of the *Missouri* personnel?

Mr. DELLUMS. There are severe Navy housing problems in the bay area and we must begin as soon as possible to solve those problems. But it is going to take the cooperation of all the parties involved—the Navy, the local government officials, and the community—if a solution is to be found to reduce the housing shortage.

I would hope we could provide housing near the bases, because in addition to housing shortages, the traffic congestion bottlenecks in the bay area are crippling. We don't need a lot of new long distance commuters.

I believe the city of Alameda is doing some work on ways to produce new rental units through the substantial rehabilitation of existing housing and mixed-use structures. I think we should look more deeply into this approach and if it is workable for the military, see if other bay area cities would be interested in similar approaches.

As you know, I have made the issue of improving the quality-of-life of our service members a top priority of this subcommittee. We are certainly open to exploring any proposals that appear to provide a solution to reducing this deficit. It is clear that no one approach alone will solve the military family housing problem.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The Alameda-type proposal is the kind of mixed housing project that I like. It can help shore up older communities and keep those cities vibrant.

The Navy has expressed some interest in buying—for somewhere between $7 and $20 million—some vacant land on a ridge between San Leandro and Castro Valley, to place hundreds of units of Navy housing. There is some earthquake danger in the area, there is a lack of local support services, and none of the surrounding communities want this open land turned into a housing project. I hope the subcommittee chairman could ask the Navy to avoid this kind of expensive, compound-type housing in the bay area and to explore scatter-site and rehab housing as by far the best choice.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I agree that large compounds of military housing apart from a military base have caused problems in other parts of the country. I can assure the gentleman that the subcommittee will look into this situation and that the concerns you raised will be brought to the attention of the Navy, as we attempt to provide additional military family housing in the bay area.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership in providing good housing for our Nation's Service personnel.

□ 1405

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague for his comments, and I am very pleased to work with him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to another one of my colleagues from California [Mr. COELHO], for the purposes of entering into a brief colloquy.

Mr. COELHO. I would like to join in the remarks made by my colleague from California about the role of the gentleman from California as chairman of this subcommittee and what he is doing for the Armed Services personnel throughout the world. We appreciate that leadership that he has provided.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would first of all like to commend him and the members of his subcommittee for the time and attention they have devoted to programs to improve the quality of life of our men and women in uniform.

The tragic suicide of a 13-year-old boy at Fort Ord last year, brought into sharp focus the widespread shortage of affordable housing for military families. Therefore, I applaud the subcommittee for increasing the authorization for construction, operation and maintenance, and leasing of military family housing by more than $460 million over the appropriation for fiscal year 1985.

I am particularly interested in the build-lease program. A 1984 Air Force housing survey disclosed that there was insufficient housing available for Air Force families in the communities adjacent to Castle Air Force Base, which is located in my district. In April of this year, Castle was notified that it was 1 of 4 bases selected by SAC Headquarters to receive build-lease housing. Anticipating that in fiscal year 1986 the Congress would expand the test program authorized under Public Law 98-115, Castle was told to solicit community support for building 200 additional units of family housing.

I can understand the committee's reluctance to approve any further build-lease projects until the two demonstration projects are completed, and the results analyzed. At the same time, I want to emphasize that there is already an urgent need for more family housing at Castle Air Force Base, and I would hope that the committee will be prepared to authorize construction of additional family housing either under build-lease or some other program in the not too distant future. Can the chairman shed some light on the committee's timetable on this?

Mr. DELLUMS. Yes. I think the gentleman raises a good question. For the record, I would like to make the following response:

As my colleague is aware, this subcommittee has given very special attention to the needs of the military

for additional affordable family housing. The test program the gentleman has mentioned is but one of the avenues we are following to increase the family housing inventory around our military bases.

Earlier this year, this gentleman, along with others and staff, toured several military bases in California to look specifically into the issue of family housing. I can assure my colleague that as a result of those visits I became increasingly aware that renewed efforts must be made both within the Department of Defense as well as by the local communities to find solutions to increasing housing availability for our military families.

I might add, parenthetically, that this is becoming a problem where military and civilian people both are competing for the shrinking inventory of affordable housing. So this is becoming an issue of crisis proportions that we have to address, and I think this subcommittee certainly is moving down that road.

Mr. COELHO. I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, it is particularly acute with the trainees that are coming into Castle, and so forth, to be able to afford some type of housing.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I might just add that, however, this issue cannot be viewed in isolation, as I said, from the shortages of housing in the civilian population, since housing is a problem both outside as well as inside the military. It seems to me that we must find a way to work together. Although I cannot give the gentleman a specific timetable, I feel that I can speak for all of my colleagues on the committee when I say that we will not only continue to fund traditional family housing construction but also explore other approaches that may provide housing as quickly and as economically as possible at such bases as Castle Air Force Base that my colleague is very concerned about and understands the issues in a very intimate and profound way.

Mr. COELHO. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

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

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, sometime earlier this year there was widely circulated a scare list of possible base closures. This list struck fear into the hearts of the very communities in which these bases were located, because many times we would find that such a facility is the very core of the economic activity of a particular region. On that scare list appeared the base located in New Cumberland in central Pennsylvania. We know, firsthand, of the adverse consequences felt just by the publication of that scare list. Since that time, because of the diligent work of this subcommittee and by the considered ear of the gentleman from California who listened to the concerns expressed as to the scare list, the cloud has been removed. This has adverse consequences, the publication of such a list, in 2 different fashions: Not only does it hurt the people whose jobs and whose economy and whose situations in life are surrounding a particular facility, but also it throws a monkey wrench into the very program of national defense which we are so carefully trying to construct.

If indeed in the middle of construction projects, in the middle of new facilities geared for the modernization of our national security, there comes a scare list of possible base closures, this can do serious harm to the steady, proper, progressive planning for the maintenance of our national security. It is, therefore, with deep gratitude that I, who have observed this phenomenon, say to the gentleman from California that his inclusion in the committee report of an end of speculation as to this national list of base closures and of possible realignment of missions does a service not only to the people affected but also to our Nation in its plans for modernization and continuance of national security.

I thank the gentleman. I can report back to the people in New Cumberland: Your mission is safe, your mission must go on, your mission is to contribute to the national security of the United States of America.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], another very diligent member of the committee.

Mr. ORTIZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, H.R. 1409—the Military Construction Authorization Act for 1986 and compliment our chairman, Mr. DELLUMS, on his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. I find it a privilege and a pleasure to work with such a hard-working committee and staff that are truly professional. I recognize the great responsibility that this committee has, not only to this distinguished House, but to our people and this great Nation.

Many times in the past, funding for the living and working conditions of our men and women in uniform have been deferred, out of necessity, to the operational requirements of our force modernization programs. This has been accomplished in order that the peace we strive for may be maintained through our military preparedness and strength. Thus, we can demonstrate to our adversaries the military readiness and deterrence from war that our Nation possesses. This is as it should be. However, there comes a time when the quality of life for the men and women in uniform must not take a back seat to the driving forces of upgrading our weapons and support equipment required to enhance, should the need arise, a smooth transition from peace to a full wartime footing. I believe this bill, H.R. 1409, does just that.

A high priority has been placed on the quality of life for our men and women in uniform, their families, and their various needs, especially the construction of new housing units here in the United States and overseas. I fully realize that the military construction authorization does not exist in a vacuum. It should be considered in the full context of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for 1986. It is with this understanding that this bill provides funding for the beddown of weapons systems. These systems include the MX missile, B-1B bomber, ground-launched cruise missiles, F-15 fighter aircraft, the C-5B cargo plane, and the space defense initiatives, as well as first year funding to support construction of two new homeport sites for the Navy. This proposed bill is within the overall House approved Defense authorization and budget guidelines.

As was stated by the Honorable John O. Marsh, Jr., Secretary of the Army, and Gen. John A. Wickham, Jr., Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in hearings before our subcommittee and the House Armed Services Committee, "our most important mission is to maintain the readiness of the Army in order to protect this great Nation. Readiness is inextricably tied to solders' morale and discipline, and to sustaining their families' strength." As the pool of potential enlistees decline, we need to provide those tangible benefits that let our service personnel and their families know that we support them and that we will provide for their welfare. Truly, this bill provides those living facilities and support systems so necessary to promote the quality of life and facilities that will maintain our force of excellence.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorization bill under consideration today by this body. I particularly want to express support for authorized projects at Vance AFB and Tinker AFB, both of which are in Oklahoma.

Vance AFB, a pilot training base, is part of the Air Training Command [ATC]. As we all know, ATC bases are

where Air Force pilot trainees learn to fly before going on to advanced training and regular flying duty for the Air Force. It is training such as that offered at Vance that enables pilots to develop the flying skills later applied in the operation of advanced fighters, bombers, and support aircraft. H.R. 1409 contains two authorized projects for Vance, a central life support equipment facility authorized at $660,000 and a mission support facility authorized at $3,550,000. These two projects are desperately needed.

The central life support equipment facility will provide a safe and environmentally secure structure for aircrew life support systems; items such as parachutes and oxgen masks. Current facilities at Vance are woefully inadequate for the storage and maintenance of these vital systems.

The mission support facility at Vance AFB will provide a centrally located facility designed to house 15 missions support functions, including those for administration and base personnel. These closely related offices are currently located in widely dispersed, inefficient, World War II-vintage buildings. In addition, it is estimated that the modern, centralized facility will result in annual operation and maintenance cost savings of more than $474,000 and a 55-percent reduction in energy usage that saves and addditional $15,000 annually. The mission support facility is urgently needed now.

Tinker AFB, a vital cog in our Nation's Air Logistics Command, has several authorized projects totaling $33.1 million. Authorized are funds for: First, a transient munitions facility and land acquisitions; second, and E-3A maintenance hanger; third, alterations for Tinker's petroleum operations storage complex and base unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing; and fourth, additions and alternations for the heating plant and recreation center.

While it would require to much time to detail the need for each of these authorized projects, I would like to briefly address the authorizations for the transient munitions facility authorized at $6,900,000 and the E-3A maintenance hangar authorized at $6,800,000.

The transient munitions facility is a safety and security improvement. It will provide the air depot at Tinker with the capability to respond to crises throughout the world in a safe and expeditious manner. The handling and transshipment of the munitions is a hazardous business. This facility will provide an extra measure of safety for those who work in this area.

The E-3A, or AWAC's, has become an indispensible tool of the Air Force. Tinker AFB is the home of AWAC's. The AWAC's and its crew, must be prepared to deploy at a moments notice to any part of the globe. This requirement makes an up-to-date maintenance facility vital to the mission of this aircraft. That is why the E-3A maintenance hangar authorized in H.R. 1409 is so very important.

And so, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I urge the adoption of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorization bill.

□ 1420

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my words of compliment for the gentleman from California to those that have been expressed by so many other Members on the floor in the course of this general debate.

Indeed, as I listened to the comments coming from so many varied philosophical sources on this floor, I am almost awestruck. It seems to me that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has taken the admonition of our former distinguished President, Lyndon Johnson, who said: "Come let us reason together," and has managed to have people from all shades of opinion in the armed services community come and reason together and to find him to be a most reasonable and sensitive chairman of that important subcommittee.

Given the view that I have of the job that the gentleman has done and the commendation that he justifiably received, I would therefore rise with some sense of trepidation under normal circumstances in opposing the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1986. In doing so. however, I know the gentleman from California knows that not only is there no criticism of him intended, but that he and I share the very sentiments that he expressed when he cast his vote against the very bill that he reported out of committee in which he so eloquently set forth the reasons and concerns he had for voting against that bill.

Among my reasons and his reasons for opposing this bill is the inclusion of money for the home ports that the Navy is proposing to build in a number of locations, including one in New York Harbor. The Home Port Fleet, which is a surface action group, in New York would consist of the battleship *Iowa* and six support vessels which would be equipped to carry nuclear weapons.

A total of $86.2 million in first-year funding is authorized in this bill for land acquisition, housing, site improvement, and berthing pier/bulkhead construction. This bill contains initial funding for two of the five new homeports the Navy seeks to build in an effort to disperse its fleet.

Now, the dispersal is supposed to be a strategic dispersal, according to the Secretary of the Navy. However, there have been some questions raised both in the gentleman's committee as well as in the equivalent committee over in the other body as to whether in fact this is a strategic dispersal for military purposes or political purposes. I think in any event there are going to be studies undertaken in both Houses to determine the real purpose of this dispersal and to determine the dangers they may represent.

I strongly object to this funding—an increase of more than $65 million over the amount requested by the Defense Department—because the Navy has failed to satisfy the concerns of my constituents and thousands of other area residents about the risks associated with stationing nuclear weapons in their backyard.

The importance of the Navy's failure to communicate with New York residents—and their elected representatives—cannot be overstated. Only recently we learned that the Defense Department failed to inform State officials in New Jersey about the extent of radioactive contamination resulting from a Bomarc missile explosion and fire at McGuire Air Force Base that occurred in 1960. New Jersey environmental officials only learned the details by accident—25 years later.

We still do not fully know whether population areas were exposed, but we do know that the true magnitude of the radioactive release was kept from the public and Government agencies. In a 1981 report, the Defense Department asserted that the radioactive contamination was restricted "to an area immediately beneath the weapon and an adjacent elongated area approximately 100 feet long." However, it was recently revealed that about 400,000 square feet, or nearly 10 acres of the base property, had been sealed in concrete to contain the contamination.

Moreover, the Defense Department is reportedly still not cooperating with State officials attempting to identify the risk and eliminate the hazard.

New Jersey residents have every right to demand more responsible conduct from the Air Force. And they, along with New Yorkers, have every right to insist that the Navy respond to their health and safety concerns before a single nuclear weapon is brought into our harbor.

Unfortunately, the Navy's response to date has been silence. The environmental impact statement prepared by the Navy looked at the impact of the Staten Island home port on air quality and harbor dredging; it even studied its effect on traffic. Yet there is no mention of the single aspect which could pose more of a threat to the health and welfare of the area's resi-

dents, and of all life in the area, than any other conceivable impact: a nuclear weapons accident.

This constitutes a clear violation of the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]. Federal agencies, according to NEPA, must conduct a thorough environmental impact analysis of all aspects of a proposed action that affect the environment in any way.

The Navy has been equally deficient in its attitude toward emergency preparedness planning. The general lack of communication to date between the Defense Department, and State, and local enforcement and health officials in this area is truly disturbing. In the absence of a workable, highly coordinated area emergency response and evacuation plan, the home port plan should simply not go forward.

The EIS, in claiming substantial economic benefit to the New York area without providing convincing evidence, is faulty in a second, serious respect. The Navy reached its economic conclusions without waiting for a fiscal impact analysis currently underway by the Pentagon, a study prompted by concerns in the Defense Department itself, that the home ports economic benefits were overstated. An accurate assessment, I believe, would show the home port to be a costly cousin to alternative investment at Staten Island.

Two recent developments underscore the inadvisability of providing funding for the home port.

First, a coalition of individuals and groups filed suit against the Navy this past April, charging gross violations of NEPA. The coalition includes Friends of the Earth, Physicians for Social Responsibility, New York PIRG and seven members of the New York City Council.

The suit, which is pending, argues that the EIS prepared by the Navy was deficient because it fails to: First, discuss the risks or potential environmental impacts of a nuclear weapons accident; second, consider less populous alternatives sites for the proposed home port; and, third, adequately discuss the adverse economic impacts of the home port on the Metropolitan New York area.

The plaintiffs are seeking an injunction prohibiting the Navy from advancing its New York plans until it prepares a new EIS that complies with NEPA.

In another recent development, the Navy recently announced that it will prepare a supplemental EIS to address a number of changes in its Staten Island proposal. Primarily, the Navy reports that it seriously underestimated the supply of adequate, affordable housing available to the 2,200 families it will move to the New York area. The draft supplemental will not be released until December.

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

Mr. WEISS. I only have limited time. The gentleman from Colorado has a great deal of time left.

In addition to that, a referendum is now on the ballot for the November 5 election to allow the people of the city of New York to state for themselves whether they want a floating nuclear silo in the midst of the most densely populated area in the country.

□ 1430

I concur with the views of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the Committee on Armed Services. The Navy's homeporting policy should be examined more closely before we commit millions of dollars to building new naval facilities and locate nuclear weapons in New York and in the ports of some of our other more densely populated cities.

The funding authorized in this bill would permit the Navy to proceed rapidly in building its base on Staten Island without having addressed a number of highly controversial issues.

While my main concern is with the authorization of the ill-considered home port on Staten Island, I am also opposed to a number of expenditures envisioned, expenditures for the MX missiles, for the Trident II or D-5 missile, and for a number of other destabilizing first-strike weapons.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding the time to me, and for all the reasons I set forth, I oppose this bill.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST].

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the words of my colleague, the gentleman from New York, and I would just say this: I expect to vote for the bill, but if the bill should lose, I would just like to say for the record that we in the Second District of Virginia, the great Port of Hampton Roads, and the Navy capital of the world, the city of Norfolk, would love to have those ships, nuclear weapons notwithstanding. We would take every one we can get, and we would welcome those Navy families to our bosom.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say on behalf of the great city of New York that we are not going to give up the ships so easily to anyplace else. I appreciate this feeling about it, but I could not let this opportunity go by, Mr. Chairman, and fail to respond to the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

As we listen to his arguments opposing the home port, he starts off talking about it being a safety issue, but then he goes from safety, to ship dispersal, to economic benefits. The fact is that I think the objection of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] is because it is a military project.

I would like to respond point by point, if I may. What do we get by ship dispersal? If we look today at the number of ships that we have at some of our ports, I think we will have an idea or we should have an idea as to how vulnerable we are. At Charleston, there are 70-some-odd ships based there today; at Norfolk, 120-plus ships; and at San Diego, 120-plus ships.

Now, I am deeply concerned that over 50 percent of our naval fleet is homeported at three centers. It only makes sense, I think, that if we are going to be building more ships and retrofitting others, we do not put them all in three locations. Have we not learned any lessons from Pearl Harbor?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] talks about the support of some members of the city council for his position. What he did not say was that this project for New York City has been heavily endorsed by Governor Cuomo of New York, by Governor Kean of New Jersey, by both Senators from New York, Mr. D'AMATO and Mr. MOYNIHAN, and by both Senators from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG and Mr. BRADLEY, and as a matter of fact, it was endosed by every Member of Congress from New York and every Member of Congress from New York City, with the exception of the gentleman who just spoke, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

So I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], you stand all by yourself or you have stood all by yourself as a member of the congressional delegation opposing the project from its inception.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. No; I will not yield. I will give the gentleman the same courtesy he gave me.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk about the safety items. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] was not satisfied with the safety issues. He was not satisfied because he did not get the decision his way, so he went to the General Accounting Office and requested a study. It took 18 bloody months to get the General Accounting Office to release the study that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] requested, and when it came out, it was certainly not supportive of his position.

So what did he do? He accused the General Accounting Office and said they did a terrible job. I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr.

WEISS], you cannot have it both ways. What the General Accounting Office said was that in this surface action group, one of the ships would be capable of carrying nuclear-tipped missiles, the Tomahawk missile, and GAO said that it was the safest nuclear missile in the entire missile fleet.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to express my support for the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI]. As he well knows, the decision to seek a naval surface action group was supported by a large majority of the New York congressional delegation.

Over the past weekend, I had the privilege of attending the deliberation of the North Atlantic assembly, at its meeting which was held in San Francisco. At our luncheon I happened to sit next to Mayor Feinstein, who mentioned to me that in San Francisco some months ago, there had been the same kind of irrational fear of the homeporting of the battleship *Missouri* in San Francisco. Mayor Feinstein told me that in spite of the opposition that was building up, as it has been doing in New York City as well, she appealed to the business community of that great naval city, San Francisco, and they came up with overwhelming support for welcoming a great historic battleship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI] has expired.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the mayor of the city of New York our former colleague, Ed Koch, doing the same thing, because, as the gentleman in the well knows, and other members of the delegation know, bringing that naval action force into New York City is going to generate some $500 million every year. So certainly that economic benefit cannot be ignored.

I feel certain that perhaps if Mayor Koch were to consult with Mayor Feinstein, she might be able to give him some other hints as to how to overcome this very irrational antinuclear opposition to bringing back naval ships into New York City, which over the years has always been a great naval town, a major part of the U.S. fleet on the east coast so that we can protect ourselves from those enemies that maybe around us.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

When this project was first announced, there were two main objections that were raised by the gentleman from New York and others. The first, and the one that put fear into everybody's heart, was the thought of an accidental explosion of a nuclear device, and, of course, everybody should be concerned about that.

It is interesting, though, after we started getting information from the Navy and others, I understand that the position of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], today is that even he acknowledges the fact that the possibility of accidental explosion is so remote, just like the General Accounting Office said, that it does not exist.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from New York—yes.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend for yielding.

I have said from the very beginning that the problem was the release of radioactive material. It does not have to be an explosion; it can be fire, it can be an accident, it can be damage, it can be sabotage. In any one of those ways, radioactive material can be released into New York Harbor.

Mr. MOLINARI. If I understand the gentleman now—and this is important because we do have a referendum coming up, and we do have other issues coming up in debates—he does recognize in fact and he concedes, as I understand it, that there is no possibility and he is not concerned about an accidental nuclear explosion? Is that correct?

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. I have said from the very beginning that the possibility of explosion as such is extremely remote, very unlikely.

Mr. MOLINARI. All right. The issue of plutonium, then, is the only other safety issue that has been raised in the floor debate. As far as the information from the Navy is concerned—and I think the gentleman from New York is absolutely incorrect in terms of sharing information—the Navy has been extremely forthright in giving us requested information. There has been an exchange of correspondence from the Department of Energy, from the Navy, from the Defense Department, and from Mr. Weinberger back and forth to the mayor, to every elected official, and to others.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Would the gentleman please share with his colleagues his information as to what planning has been done for emergency action in case of an accident? Will the gentleman tell us what the Navy has told him about that?

□ 1440

Mr. MOLINARI. The Navy has not planned any emergency action. I do not think it is the province of the Navy to do that. I think that is the province of your local government. That is the position they have taken throughout the country.

Now, they will work with local government in planning. They have said that. They will work with you to implement the plan.

Mr. WEISS, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOLINARI. Yes, I will yield further.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know whether in fact the Navy has shared information with the local governments as to whether and what kind of accidents the localities ought to be preparing for?

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, let me respond this way perhaps. I took advantage of something that every Member of Congress has, and that is the opportunity to get a classified briefing at the Pentagon. I do not know if the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] did so, but I did.

Mr. WEISS. I did.

Mr. MOLINARI. I came away after 3 hours fully satisfied and had no apprehensions or fears whatsoever. I stand in the well here and I can say to my constituents back home, please accept it without any fear or trepidation whatsoever. There are 30 years of record that the Navy has had with nuclear weapons, a superb record, without one single nuclear accident.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MOLINARI. I would be happy to yield even though the gentleman did not want to yield to me.

Mr. WEISS. I had no time. The gentleman has all kinds of time.

The gentleman is not suggesting to this body, or to his constituents, or my constituents that in private briefings the gentleman was given information as to existing information which the Navy has shared with localities as to how they could prepare for emergencies; the gentleman is not saying that, is the gentleman?

Mr. MOLINARI. No, I am not.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, because I was given no such information.

Mr. MOLINARI. The issue of economic benefits I think we should dispense with very quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding these 2 additional minutes.

On the issue of economic benefits, I think there has been a great deal of debate in the New York City area about economic benefits. There is no question that there are substantial economic benefits. We may debate as to how much, but I do not think there is any question remaining that the benefits are indeed substantial.

I would like to close, however, by referring to something that the chairman mentioned before. I think it is very important, and this is related to the home port issue; that is the aspect of the funding level in the bill dealing with the quality of life.

I do not know how many Members of this body have taken the time out to go to military bases and see how our military people are living. It is shocking. It is absolutely shocking if you visit the areas where I live and see how our military people are living. If they were ordinary citizens and not in the military, I think they would be asking for public assistance from local governments.

How we, as Members of Congress, can permit that is something that is deeply disturbing to me.

So I commend the gentleman from California, the chairman, and the other members of the committee for what they have done here and I hope that we support the chairman in his efforts here today.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to rise on behalf of San Diego and the Navy families in San Diego and thank the committee and the chairman and the ranking member for the work and the consideration that they gave us in regard to the housing that will be built, some 200 units for Navy housing.

I would like to thank the chairman especially for the time that he spent and the trip that he took to San Diego examining the situation very closely.

I just would like to say one last thing, and that is that in California our big problem generally with regard to military construction and housing is the land prices. I very much like the ideas that have been floated several times during the debate and during the discussion concerning the possibility of leasing land, having contractors come on and build units and then pay over a period of time based on the capability of our enlisted people to pay for their Navy housing or Army housing allowance, to pay for those units; in other words, the idea of not having in the future perhaps to spend up front appropriation money for the military construction itself.

I commend the committee for taking a look at that and I hope we can do that in the next several years.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

I just want to make one point on the home port issue.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI], a gentleman I also served with in the State legislature in New York, is a very thoughtful person and someone who has worked very hard ferreting out all the answers to the questions that were brought up concerning home ports.

We would all certainly agree that it is ludicrous at best to home port half our naval fleet in three ports; so once the decision was made, which as I say makes eminent good sense, the competition was on as to where these ships would be home ported.

In the State of New York and city of New York, the State and Federal legislators worked very hard convincing the Navy that this was the most appropriate cost-efficient place to home port this battle group.

I want to point out that there is no doubt in anybody's mind that as far as the vast majority of the elected officials and opinion leaders in the State of New York, they want very much to have that battle group in New York Harbor.

I salute the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI]. I salute the Governor. I salute the mayor. I salute both U.S. Senators from New York and from New Jersey, and the vast majority of the delegation from New York headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] who support home porting.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the military construction authorization of funds for New York City homeporting for the *Iowa*. The homeporting is being sold to New Yorkers as safe and economically beneficial. Unfortunately, both the safety and economic aspects have not been explored sufficiently to allow New Yorkers to know with any degree of certainty whether or not they will benefit from the homeporting.

Advocates of homeporting argue that it will bring jobs to New York and help the economy. After the initial building is over, it is unclear that the naval base will bring any jobs to New Yorkers. Yes, it will bring another payroll to New York but there is no certainty that it will bring jobs which will be filled by the local residents who must contend with the hardships and risks related to the base. The naval jobs will be filled with men and women from all over the country. Base-related jobs are usually reserved for the families of service members who are assigned to that base. From the beginning the economic facts of this situation have not been stated honestly.

On the safety issue, some Members of Congress have been reassured that there is no safety problem. I am one of those who has not been so reassured. In the end this is an important judgment call. It would appear that safety, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder and I cannot believe that the various nuclear mishaps which have happened here in the States and in Europe were intentional so I must conclude that serious accidents can happen. To accept, as an article of faith, that there will be no accidents in densely populated New York is to gamble needlessly with the lives of human beings. The New York Port represents one of the most densely populated areas in the world. When nuclear accident risk possibilities are being weighed, special allowances should be made for New York City.

The homeporting issue is on the ballot in New York. The people will have the opportunity to express their will directly. It is only reasonable for Members who represent New York City to wait upon this expression of support or lack of support. No commitment should be made prior to the results of the referendum on this issue. This is an important judgment call which all interested citizens should be given an opportunity to make.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today and address the subjects of military housing and the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1986. I would first like to address the issue of military housing.

Those of my distinguished colleagues who have heard me speak on the issue of military housing in the past know that this is a very important issue to me and it is one about which I feel deeply. Not just because I, too, experienced the military family life, and not just because a young boy hanged himself at a military installation in my district last year because the hardships imposed on his family by shortages in military family housing and moving expenses; but because I am convinced that our Nation's defense is only as strong as the men and women who serve as the cogs of our great defensive wheel.

In the past, my comments on the issue of military family housing have been tinged with sadness, and filled with determination. Today, however, I am glad to report to this distinguished body that I am optimistic that we are on our way to meeting the challenges faced by our military personnel and their families; not just in my district on the Monterey Peninsula, but all over the country, and the world.

I am optimistic because the House has approved a Department of Defense authorization that contains numerous provisions that seek to address the challenges, financial and emotional challenges, facing our military personnel and their families. I am

pleased to have introduced the first legislative package to address these challenges, and I am hopeful that relief for our men and women in uniform and their dependents may soon be on the way.

I am also pleased today to lend my support to the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1986. This bill calls for $9.5 billion in military construction during the next fiscal year. That might seem like a small sum compared to the rest of entire Department of Defense authorization recommendation of $302.6 billion, and indeed it is—the military construction request is only 3 percent of the total budget recommended by the House Armed Services Committee. But, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you what a mere 3 percent can do.

This money will provide for the construction of 600 units of housing at Ford Ord, CA, and the upgrading of almost 600 more units that have been found by the Army to be substandard. Think of that, ladies and gentlemen, some of our military personnel live in substandard housing—but not for long. This money will also provide for 70 mobile home spaces at Ford Ord—a post where 2,500 families are currently on waiting lists for on-post housing.

Plans also call for the construction of barracks for enlisted personnel that will house nearly 1,000 individuals, at a cost of $23 million. I speak of Fort Ord because I happen to represent that area, because I once served at Ford Ord, and because that is where 13-year-old Danny Holley hanged himself. The average wait for on-post housing at that facility is 5 to 7 months. Fort Ord has recently awarded a contract to a local construction firm that will provide more than 200 mobile home spaces for military personnel. Where the housing situation has been critical, there is now hope.

These construction plans will mean a great deal to an estimated 2,500 military families at Fort Ord alone. And yet the total price tag is $84 million—only three-tenths of 1 percent of the total Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1986. And that is at Fort Ord alone.

Military housing construction plans call for 50 mobile home spaces at Fort Riley, KS; 50 more at Fort Bragg, NC; and 282 housing units at the Marine Corps Air Station in El Toro, CA. The military housing plans reach across the seas to the Netherlands and West Germany, as well. And we can do all this, and virtually change the lives of an estimated 5,570 persons with only 3 percent of the total Defense authorization recommended by the House Armed Services Committee.

While family housing is certainly the most visible component of the Military Construction Act, it is not the only issue that I would like to address today, because military construction can take many forms, other than military housing. I am talking about the construction plans for military facilities such as Fort Hunter Liggett, the Presidio of Monterey, and the Naval Postgraduate School, as well as Fort Ord—facilities which have been able to contribute so much to our national security and defensive capabilities. But facilities which are also in desperate need of expansion, or upgrading, in order to continue to perform these valuable functions to their full potential.

Fort Hunter Liggett, for example, has asked for $11.1 million for the construction of a multipurpose range complex and a technical documentation facility. The House Armed Services Committee, recognizing the value of these projects, has recommended full funding of the administration's request. For the Presidio of Monterey, the Department of Defense has set aside $2.65 million for the construction of a military personnel administration center. This center is required to provide a consolidated Army/USAF center together with administration headquarters for Army/Navy/Air Force/Marine Corps contingents at the Defense Language Institute. The Department of Defense concluded in a recent study that the failure to provide this center would result in a growing inefficiency in operation at the Presidio. Again, the House Committee on Armed Services has recommended full funding.

The Navy has requested $13 million for an ocean science academic building which would greatly increase the oceanographic study capabilities at Monterey, an area that has long been recognized as the center for oceanographic study, research, and fleet communications. This building would complement an already impressive array of marine and oceanographic feacilities on the Monterey Bay, including the Monterey Bay Aquarium funded by Hewlett-Packard, the Moss Landing Marine Lab, the Naval Environmental Prediction Research Facility, and the Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center.

The Army has asked for $3 million to be spent on the energy monitoring and control system, a medical supply warehouse, and an operations building at Fort Ord. The operations building is needed to provide an operational facility for the Criminal Investigation District Headquarters at Fort Ord. Current investigations are conducted out of a substandard and deteriorating temporary facility that was constructed in 1941. The Department of Defense has determined that the building is not suitable for modification, and the House Armed Services Committee has recommended full funding for construction of a new facility.

Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about a major weapons system. I am not talking about changing the nature of our warfighting machine. I am not even talking about charges of waste and fraud in our Defense Department. In other words, I am not addressing a controversial or partisan issue. I am talking about the welfare of our men and women in uniform and their dependent families.

Why is it, after all, that in the strongest and richest nation on Earth some of our military personnel are forced to live in substandard housing unit that was built as a temporary facility prior to World War II? Why is it that military families are forced to separate, or squeeze a family of 5 into a camping trailer in a campground along with 30 other families that has only one hot shower? There is no reason for this situation. But there is a solution. And that solution will cost less than the price of two F-14A Tomcat aircraft—and Navy has requested 18 of these aircraft for the next fiscal year alone.

In examining the important issue of our national defense, I believe it essential that we not overlook that element of our military that is most vulnerable and most in need of our assistance—the human element. We can, after all, talk until we are blue in the face about weapons systems and strategic superiority or inferiority, but it does not mean a thing unless we address needs of our military personnel in housing and facilities.

After extensive hearings and testimonies, the House Armed Services Committee has forwarded a balanced proposal that would meet the immediate needs of housing and military construction at a reasonable cost. I urge this body to accept that proposal.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the $12.8 million authorization for the proposed construction of the Air Force Institute of Technology [AFIT] at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The Institute is a U.S. Air Force organization which is responsible for providing and coordinating advanced degree programs, professional continuing education, and support for basic and applied research. Many of its courses are unique and are offered only by AFIT. These educational programs are designed to meet the highly specialized needs of the Department of Defense. Because of its special location at Wright-Patterson, which is the largest center for defense research and development, AFIT offers rare opportunities for engineering and logistics instruction.

The student load at this center is increasing substantially. Moreover, the AFIT has greater demands for computer space. There is currently a total space deficiency of 256,000 square feet based upon existing needs. This project is designed to enhance the existing facility at Wright-Patterson which is in dire need of a new building to alleviate the problem of overcrowding. The proposed facility improvements will provide a better learning environment for those persons enrolled at this science and research center.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this authorization. It will enhance AFIT's ability to serve the Air Force and our national security interests by providing first-rate instruction to Air Force officers and airmen.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1409, the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986. This bill authorizes all funds for military construction and military family housing in the United States and overseas.

This bill authorizes $4.2 million for the construction of a navigation equipment laboratory at the Naval Air Development Center [NADC] in Warminster, PA, which is located in my district. I want to thank my colleague from Wisconsin, Representative LES ASPIN, the distinguished chairman

of the House Armed Services Committee, for his support of this important project. I also want to again thank the distinguished chairman for visiting NADC with me on April 19, 1985.

The NADC is vitally important to the Department of the Navy since it is the leading naval air research laboratory in the United States. It is responsible for research in such critical areas as air warfare analysis, air combat systems engineering, aircraft navigation, surface ship navigation, submarine navigation, and air command and control systems. No other naval research facility performs the functions assigned to the NADC, particularly in both land-based and carrier-based antisubmarine warfare. The NADC also recently developed the reconnaissance module for the FA-18 aircraft.

The NADC is also very important to my constituents in the Eighth District as it is the second largest employer in my district. It is a modern and expanding facility that employs 2,633 people, including 2,385 civilians. The growing role of the NADC is highlighted by the fact that this year there have been 300 vacant engineering and technical positions at the Center, positions which the Navy has been filling.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the continued vitality of one of the most important facilities in my district. Beyond that, however, I am convinced based on the visits I have made to the Center that the NADC is fulfilling its vital national security mission for the Navy. It is in the best interest of the country that the NADC continue its important operations in Warminster. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the military construction bill which includes the authorization for this new laboratory.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorizations for fiscal year 1986. This legislation authorizes the transfer of the Army's Arlington Hall Station to the jurisdiction of the U.S. State Department through the General Services Administration for location of the Foreign Service Institute.

My constituents, Defense Department officials and the administration agree that development of the FSI at Arlington Hall would be an asset for the Arlington community. I think it is fair to say that it is unusual when a Member of Congress supports the closing of a military installation in his or her congressional district. However, the relocation of Arlington Hall's current tenant, the Intelligence and Security Command to Fort Belvoir, VA, is a positive move for the military and for the intelligence community. This is also an efficient use of Federal property and presents a rare opportunity for the people of northern Virgnia to be a part of plans to locate the facility where the prestigious corps of foreign service officials and diplomats will be trained.

The necessary first step for this proposed transfer is congressional funding of $30 million for a new headquarters for the Intelligence Command and Control Facility at Fort. Belvoir. The Senate has included this amount as part of its military construction legislation and it is my hope that a joint House-Senate conference on this bill can resolve this difference in spending priorities.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorization for next fiscal year, but more importantly, I rise to commend the committee and the bill's manager, Chairman DELLUMS, for not being stampeded into slashing away at the military construction authorization based on a list of possible bases to be closed that surfaced in response to a request from the other body and which was never fully explained. That list became known as a hit list inspite of the fact that the Defense Department attached disclaimers to it and indicated that it was only illustrative. Those of us who represent areas of the country where those based are located knew all too well that a decision this year to halt needed work on those bases could turn illustrative into fait accompli. I personally am deeply indebted to the Armed Services Committee for the rational manner in which it put its bill together and its insistence on substantiation and explanation of that list which, without the good work of the committee, could very well have taken on a life of its own.

The House of Representatives has been well served by its committee, and I want the record to show that I, for one, am most appreciative.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have no more requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, we are now concluding with the general debate on the military construction bill for fiscal year 1986. I think my colleagues and I have done an adequate job in presenting to this body what we have done, how we did it and where we are at this particular moment.

I would just like for a brief moment to comment on the last debate that took place between and among my colleagues from New York. Without in any way commenting to the merits of the case, simply to say that this debate only underscores the desire of the Chair to bring the military construction budget within the umbrella of the total authorization bill, because these are policy matters that cut across the entire length and breadth of the military budget.

The debate to some extent becomes relatively distorted, Mr. Chairman, when it gets debated at the military construction level with these policies that were made far before we get to this particular level; so my hope is that next year when we look at the total military budget that my colleagues can see the implications of their policies all the way from the tactical and strategic implications all the way to their quality of life and community implications.

So I would simply say that it only underscores the need for an indepth policy, oriented, rational, and intelligent debate, devoid of rancor, devoid of name calling, devoid of posturing at a rather superficial level, so that we can meaningfully come to grips with what is an appropriate military policy within the framework of an enlightened and intelligent foreign policy.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986".

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO], be permitted to offer an amendment out of order.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. HUTTO

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, because I have a committee to chair, I appreciate very much the willingness of the gentleman from California to allow me to offer three noncontroversial amendments that have been agreed to. Actually, one of these will be presented by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] since we both have an interest in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have one amendment he wishes to offer at this time?

Mr. HUTTO. I have two, Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has one. They are tied together.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that all three amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments be considered out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. And en bloc?

Mr. HUTTO. And en bloc.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman amend his unanimous consent request to state that the amendments be considered en bloc, for purposes of saving some time?

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have no problem with that.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has two amendments.

Mr. HUTTO. Two amendments, Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has one.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has one; but the gentleman asks unanimous consent that his two amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments, Nos. 1 and 3, be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HUTTO: Insert the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. TERMINATION DATE FOR CERTAIN AUTHORITY.

Section 808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1983, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) The authority of the Secretary to carry out this section shall terminate in October 1, 1990.".

Add the following new section at the end of the title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

(a) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Navy shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs approximately 15.31 acres of real property, including improvements thereon, at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida.

(b) USE OF LAND.—The real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) shall become part of the Barrancas National Cemetery and shall be administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) CONDITION.—If the real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purpose described in subsection (b), the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall transfer such property, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and location of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined in a survey approved by the Secretary.

Mr. HUTTO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, on the first amendment, this merely adds a sunset date of September 30, 1990, to the authority granted to the Secretary of the Air Force by section 808, Land Conveyances, Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

The second amendment relates to a parcel of land that would be shifted from the Navy to the Veterans' Administration for extension to the Barrancas National Cemetery. They were to build a brig on that, but we prevailed upon them to allow the cemetery to be extended so that we could carry through.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and for his explanation.

The Chairman would like to indicate that these two amendments were offered after the subcommittee met and the full committee met, but we have subsequently come together as a committee, we have reviewed the two amendments offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, and the committee is in support of the amendments on this side of the aisle and accepts the two amendments offered en bloc by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr HUTTO. I yield to the ranking minority member.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have had an opportunity to consider the amendments on this side and we have no objection.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] be permitted the opportunity to offer an amendment out of order.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBINSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON: Add the following new section to the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. AVIGATION RIGHTS ON SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLORIDA.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all right, title, and interest in the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1229), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. The prohibition contained in subdivision d. of the first section against the erection of any structure or obstacle on the land conveyed under this Act in excess of seventy-free feet above mean low-water level shall be deemed to be a prohibition against the erection of a structure or obstacle in excess of two hundred feet above mean low-water level in the case of that portion of such land on Santa Rosa Island which is east of the Destin East Pass and known as Holiday Isle.".

Mr. ROBINSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I will simply say in order to save time and get right to the bottom line, this amendment simply amends the avigation rights on Santa Rosa Island, FL. There was a prohibition in the law that restricted building buildings higher than 75 feet. This allows that law to be amended to allow buildings in excess of 200 feet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO] if he has any comment about this.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

This merely agrees with the Air Force that buildings in this area can be extended upward of 200 feet, instead of the original 75 feet, which was out of date.

It is my understanding that no one objects to it. It has all been worked out.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was fashioned after the subcommittee and the full committe had worked its will on the fiscal year 1986 authorization bill. The subcommittee subsequently met, reviewed all these amendments, including the one before the body at this time, and the subcommittee agrees to accept the gentleman's amendment, without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] be permitted the opportunity to offer an amendment out of order.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: Page 67, beginning on line 13, strike out section 816 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 816. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) TRANSFERS UNDER EXCESS PROPERTY PROVISIONS AUTHORIZED.—In accordance with the provisions of section 202 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483) governing transfers of excess property—

(1) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (b) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of the Army; and

(2) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (c) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of State.

(b) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT FORT MCNAIR.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the property described in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 10.5 acres, together with improvements thereon, adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia.

(c) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT ARLINGTON HALL STATION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the property decribed in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 72 acres, together with improvements thereon, known as Arlington Hall Station in Arlington County, Virginia.

Mr. BROOKS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today deals with two proposed transfers of property that are included as section 816 of H.R. 1409. As reported by the Committee on Armed Services, section 816(a) provideds for the Administrator of General Services to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Army, an 18.5-acre tract of land adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia. This land was declared excess by the Army in 1982 and control passed to GSA. Although around 8 acres of property are the subject of a legally binding sale agreement and are not available for disposition, some 10 acres remain as excess property and would be available to be returned to the Army for its needs.

Section 816(b) of the bill as reported provides for the Secretary of the Army to transfer approximately 72 acres of the Arlington Hall station property in Arlington County, VA, to the Secretary of State to be used as a center for training in foreign affairs and for other purposes. This transfer likewise would be without reimbursement.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I am sympathetic to the underlying purposes of these transfers. In the case of Fort McNair, it makes sense that this property should be returned to fill the needs of the agency that held it until just 3 years ago. And, in the case of the Arlington Hall station property, I appreciate the desirability of relocating the State Department's Foreign Service Institute to a permanent location, and the Arlington Hall station would be extremely suitable for this purpose. In addition, relocating FSI out of leased space and into a Government-owned facility would be a sensible and cost-effective step.

At the same time, I am deeply concerned that the integrity of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, which sets out a government-wide system for the utilization of federally owned property, be maintained. In order to achieve the goals of the original provisions of the bill in a manner which is consistent with current law and regulations, I am offering this amendment today. It provides authorization for the Administrator of General Services to transfer the Fort McNair property, without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of the Army, and for the nonreimbursable transfer of the Arlington Hall station property by the Administrator, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of State.

The current Federal property management regulations provide that, in cases where the Congress specifically authorizes a nonreimbursable transfer, the interagency transfer of excess property shall be without reimbursement. The amendment I am offering today constitutes such a specific congressional authorization.

I urge support for this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

□ 1455

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out to the body that this amendment is technical in nature and is offered to bring section 816 into conformance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. It is offered to satisfy jurisdictional concerns of the Committee on Government Operations.

The amendment changes no substantive provision and the committee is prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] also be provided with the opportunity to offer an amendment out of order.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: Page 71, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 819. LAND CONVEYANCE, DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, TUCSON, ARIZONA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Air Force (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the city of Tucson, Arizona (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "city") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 61 acres of real property adjacent to Golf Links/Craycroft Intersection, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—(1) In consideration for the conveyance, the city shall extend the existing lease with the Air Force covering 4,348.81 acres of real property owned by the city at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base for an additional fifty years commencing in 2002 at the existing rental rate of $773 per year.

(2) The total value of the consideration received by the United States shall be at least equal to the fair market value of the real property conveyed under subsection (a), as determined by the Secretary.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the city.

(d) CONDITION.—(1) The conveyance to the city under this section shall be subject to the condition that the real property to be conveyed shall be used for public park purposes or other purposes agreed upon by the Secretary and the city which are consistent with the primary mission of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.

(2) If the real property is used for any purpose other than a purpose described in paragraph (1), title to the real property shall revert to the United States.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance made under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would convey 61 acres of land at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base to the city of Tucson for use as a public park and refuse transfer station. In exchange the city of Tucson would extend a 50-year lease to the Air

51-059 O-86-18 (Pt. 20)

Force for 4,348 acres on the Poorman Gunnery Range.

The land to be conveyed to the city of Tucson was recently severed from the main portion of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base by extension of a major public thoroughfare across the northern boundary of the base. This land is no longer needed by the Air Force for base operations and the uses of the land by the city of Tucson are consistent with the overall objectives and mission of the base.

In fact, the park facilities and refuse transfer station would serve base personnel and the Air Force has fully endorsed this land conveyance.

The extension of an additional 50-year lease on the Poorman Gunnery Range is essential to the continued operations at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. The city of Tucson would lease the land to the U.S. Government for $773 a year. The value of the lease far exceeds the fair market value of the land to be conveyed to the city of Tucson.

This is an amendment which is in the best interests of the U.S. Government and the city of Tucson. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona insert the following:

SEC. 819. LAND CONVEYANCE, DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, TUCSON, ARIZONA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the highest and best use of the lands described or identified in subsection (b) is public park and recreational use or public health use;

(2) the city of Tucson, Arizona, has indicated a willingness to extend the existing lease to the United States Air Force of the lands described in subsection (c) for an additional fifty years commencing in 2002 at the existing rental rate of $773 per year;

(3) therefore, the Administrator of General Services should—

(A) assign to the Secretary of the Interior lands described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park or recreational area; and

(B) assign to the Secretary of Health and Human Services lands identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2) for public health use;

(4) the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be, should simultaneously with the acceptance of the extension of the lease for the lands described in subsection (c), convey to the city of Tuscon, Arizona—

(A) the property described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park or recreational area through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2)), and

(B) such land as is identified in subsection (b)(2) for public health use through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(1)(B) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(1)(B)).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND SUITABLE FOR PARK OR RECREATIONAL USE AND FOR PUBLIC HEALTH USE.—(1) The property described in this paragraph is 61 acres of real property adjacent to Golf Links/Craycroft Intersection, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona.

(2) The property identified in this paragraph is such portion (not exceeding eight acres) of the land described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with the concurrence of the Secretaries of the Interior and Defense, determines to be suitable for conveyance for public health use.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SUBJECT TO LEASE. —The property described in this subsection is 4,348.81 acres of real property owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.

(d) SURVEYS OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the city of Tucson, Arizona.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering regarding the conveyance of land at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson, AZ, would allow this transfer to go forward in a manner consistent with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act's provisions on public benefit discount conveyance of excess Federal property. The amendment would establish a congressional finding that the highest and best use of specified property at Davis-Monthan is for park and recreation use or public health use, and that the city of Tucson has indicated a willingness to extend an existing lease of 4,348.81 acres of property to the Air Force for an additional 50 years at $773 per year. The amendment states that the Administrator of General Services therefore should assign the property to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health and Human Services for park and public health uses, respectively, and that the Secretaries, simultaneously with the acceptance of the lease extension from the city, should convey the property to the city through a public benefit discount conveyance under the Federal Property Act.

Mr. Chairman, this conveyance appears to serve both the interests of the Federal Government and the city of Tucson. My amendment would allow the transaction to take place in conformity with the Federal Property Act. I urge its acceptance.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is exactly correct that we have reviewed this amendment. The people in Arizona and the military have come together, and there is no objection to the amendment. This side has no objection to the amendment.

The full subcommittee has reviewed the amendment and the Chair knows of no objection, and we certainly would be willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, we are now going back to regular order, title I.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—ARMY

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $57,580,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $32,530,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, $55,450,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, $610,000.
Fort Drum, New York, $2,990,000.
Fort Greely, Alaska, $2,500,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, $80,000,000.
Fort Hunter-Liggett, California, $11,100,000.
Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, $5,300,000.
Fort Irwin, California, $30,050,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, $110,880,000.
Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, $940,000.
Fort Meade, Maryland, $18,930,000.
Fort Ord, California, $25,820,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, $27,230,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, $3,600,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, $49,290,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, $1,440,000.
Fort Sheridan, Illinois, $3,500,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, $29,600,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, $14,000,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, $2,650,000.
Yakima Firing Center, Washington, $16,430,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Fort Shafter, Hawaii, $6,300,000.
Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii, $2,150,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, $32,460,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia, $6,450,000.
Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $7,100,000.
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, $5,300,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $39,650,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, $31,760,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, $6,100,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, $46,040,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $20,770,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $6,900,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, $15,471,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, $12,350,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, $39,350,000.
Fort Pickett, Virginia, $420,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, $9,695,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, $52,000,000.
Fort Story, Virginia, $1,950,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, $8,300,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, $4,670,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, $8,960,000.
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, $770,000.
Corpus Christi Army Depot, Texas, $4,400,000.
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, $320,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, $8,650,000.
Fort Wingate, New Mexico, $490,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $19,000,000.
McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma, $2,300,000.
Navajo Depot Activity, Arizona, $240,000.
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $88,000,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, $1,000,000.
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, $19,000,000.
Pueblo Depot Activity, Colorado, $200,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, $820,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $25,750,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, $29,000,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, $6,450,000.
Savanna Army Depot, Illinois, $510,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, $1,410,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, $2,600,000.
Tooele Army Depot, Utah, $11,490,000.
Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon, $260,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, $240,000.

AMMUNITION FACILITIES

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $320,000.
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $210,000.
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa, $810,000.
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas, $570,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $930,000.
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, Louisiana, $640,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $2,910,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $2,050,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, New York, $23,700,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, $7,600,000.
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii, $970,000.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,150,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, $3,200,000.
Oakland Army Base, California, $330,000.
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, North Carolina, $1,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Humphreys Engineer Center, Supt. Activity, Virginia, $11,000,000.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Various, United States, $3,000,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY, JAPAN

Japan, $1,050,000.

EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY

Camp Carroll, Korea, $25,380,000.
Camp Casey, Korea, $12,920,000.
Camp Castle, Korea, $1,100,000.
Camp Colbern, Korea, $550,000.
Camp Edwards, Korea, $1,090,000.
Camp Gary Owen, Korea, $580,000.
Camp Giant, Korea, $1,050,000.
Camp Greaves, Korea, $420,000.
Camp Hovey, Korea, $8,300,000.
Camp Howze, Korea, $1,980,000.
Camp Humphreys, Korea, $9,750,000.
Camp Kittyhawk, Korea, $1,600,000.
Camp Kyle, Korea, $3,580,000.
Camp Liberty Bell, Korea, $800,000.
Camp Market, Korea, $710,000.
Camp Page, Korea, $32,650,000.
Camp Pelham, Korea, $2,400,000.
Camp Red Cloud, Korea, $1,730,000.
Camp Stanley, Korea, $5,500,000.
K-16 Army Airfield, Korea, $2,350,000.
Location 177, Korea, $2,290,000.
Yongin, Korea, $2,550,000.
Yongson, Korea, $9,800,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Kwajalein, $14,600,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND OVERSEAS

Panama, $5,480,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE AND SEVENTH ARMY

Amberg, Germany, $850,000.
Ansbach, Germany, $14,390,000.
Bad Kreuznach, Germany, $1,100,000.
Bad Toelz, Germany, $1,850,000.
Bamberg, Germany, $6,490,000.
Baumholder, Germany, $900,000.
Darmstadt, Germany, $29,200,000.
Frankfurt, Germany, $18,680,000.
Friedberg, Germany, $9,150,000.
Fulda, Germany, $7,200,000.
Giessen, Germany, $1,700,000.
Goeppingen, Germany, $10,250,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, $2,450,000.
Haingruen, Germany, $680,000.
Hanau, Germany, $48,140,000.
Heidelberg, Germany, $8,800,000.
Heilbronn, Germany, $2,200,000.
Hohenfels, Germany, $6,300,000.
Kaiserslautern, Germany, $3,450,000.
Karlsruhe, Germany, $4,020,000.
Mainz, Germany, $820,000.
Neu Ulm, Germany, $1,000,000.
Nuremberg, Germany, $9,360,000.
Pirmasens, Germany, $14,000,000.
Schoeninger, Germany, $700,000.
Schweinfurt, Germany, $17,840,000.
Stuttgart, Germany, $4,500,000.
Vilseck, Germany, $10,290,000.
Wiesbaden, Germany, $2,900,000.
Wildflecken, Germany, $20,000,000.
Wuerzburg, Germany, $48,070,000.
Various Locations, Greece, $1,440,000.
Various Locations, Italy, $1,850,000.
Various Locations, Turkey, $7,440,000.

SEC. 102. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Fort Ord, California, six hundred units and seventy manufactured home spaces, $50,640,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, fifty manufactured home spaces, $712,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, twenty manufactured home spaces, $253,000.
Bamberg, Germany, one hundred and six units, $7,209,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, one hundred and thirty-eight units, $6,120,000.
Vilsek, Germany, three hundred and seventy units, $26,830,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, fifty manufactured home spaces, $700,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, fifty manufactured home spaces, $689,000.
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, one unit, $154,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, twenty manufactured home spaces, $317,000.
Fort Drum, New York, eight hundred units, $67,500,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, two units by reconfiguration and fifty manufactured home spaces, $637,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, one hundred and four units and twenty-four manufactured home spaces, $8,674,000.
Fort Myer, Virginia, six units, $596,000.

SEC. 103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $167,521,000, of which $10,950,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, one unit, $99,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, one hundred and sixty-four units, $4,712,000.
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, eighty-one units, $2,762,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKINSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKINSON: Page 3, line 26, strike out "$9,695,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,950,000".

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which adds a little less than $2½ million for the purpose of building an Army aviation museum to house the historic artifacts, memorabilia, and so forth, of the Army Air Corps, which as everyone knows was the predecessor of the Air Force.

We have $75 million worth of aircraft.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I would be very pleased to yield to my chairman, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that arrived before the subcommittee after we had met our time constraints with respect to markup, but the subcommittee has subsequently met.

All of the members reviewed the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, and there is no objection to the amendment on this side and, as far as the Chair knows, no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments to title I, and I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 8, strike out line 19.

Page 8, line 21, strike out "$9,360,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,500,000".

Page 9, after line 4, insert the following: Various Locations, Germany, $101,000,000.

Page 9, line 21, strike out "Grafenwoehr, Germany, one hundred and thirty-eight units" and insert in lieu thereof "Various locations, ninety-eight units".

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the acceptance of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, we have three amendments that we have offered en bloc. The first amendment is a technical amendment that simply corrects clerical and printing errors in the bill, and it changes no substantive provision in the bill.

The second amendment, Mr. Chairman, would provide authorization of $101 million for Army to construct a number of facilities necessary from their perspective to increase the security and safety of our Pershing missile deployment in various locations in Germany.

Mr. Chairman, the Pentagon, the Army, approached the subcommittee after the markup on a matter that they considered of grave significance, and that is the question of security and safety. We indicated that the process was over for such a relatively substantial amount of money in a serious area. We asked them why they had not come before the committee at the appropriate time. They said that the issue just manifested itself, and they were not able to get to us during the markup process.

They also indicated that because of the strength of the dollar and the savings that they have been able to realize as a result of the strong dollar in Europe that they can fund these safety and security facilities without any additional moneys being allocated. Therefore, this authority is to the tune of $101 million but it adds no additional money to the bill. It can be funded out of savings from prior funded programs.

There is no question that the problem exists. In fact, our distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] was able to make an onsite visit to some of these facilities and underscored to my colleagues on the subcommittee that these problems of security and safety, do, in fact, exist. The subcommittee reviewed this request and agreed to accept it without objection.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the third part of the three amendments offered en bloc deals with the Divad appropriation. The third amendment would reduce the Army's minor construction request from $1.68 million by deleting two ammunition storage projects in Germany. These two projects are no longer required. They were intended for the so-called Sergeant York air defense gun, commonly known as Divad, which the Department of Defense has subsequently canceled.

Therefore, this amendment brings this bill into conformity with the decision made by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to cancel the weapon system and there is no need for this accompanying construction.

Mr. Chairman, with that explanation of a technical amendment, an amendment dealing with security on the deployment issue; and third, an amendment that would delete a certain amount of money from the bill to make it conform with the decision of the Department of Defense with respect to the Divad is what I present, and I hope that my colleagues will support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The amendments were agreed to.

□ 1505

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Army will vacate Arlington Hall in the summer of 1988 and that the State Department must adhere to a very tight timetable to accomplish site planning, architectural design, and contract negotiations necessary to begin construction of the Foreign Service Institute as soon as the Army unit departs.

The existing language guarantees the site for the State Department, thereby allowing expenditure of substantial funds to implement the timetable. But the proposed amendment appears to be specific only as to the conditions of the transfer if the transfer is made to the State Department.

Would the proposed amendment that the gentleman offered allow this transfer to take place in an orderly manner?

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

Mr. WOLF. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, that is my question as well. As the gentleman knows, we passed an authorization and we would like to see this transfer take place in a time period that would be coordinated with the authorization, and that there be no unnecessary slowdown.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure both gentleman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] that it is not my intent to slow down this transfer. My amendment just authorized the nonreimbursable transfer to the Secretary of State consistent with the Federal Property Act. And given the Secretary of State's high-priority interest in the establishment of a training facility for the FSI, it should provide as much assistance as does the existing language that the State Department will receive this property. And anything I can do to expedite that, I will be glad and happy to do.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSE: Page 2, line 10, strike out "$57,580,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,390,000".

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to take advantage of an unusual opportunity which will greatly benefit the operations and training capability of the Fort Bragg military reservation.

Fort Bragg has recently completed a land-use requirements study which has shown a requirement for addition-

al land to train our increasingly mobile Army units to attack and defend on wider battlefronts than they did in World War II. The modernized weapon systems of the Army move faster and have longer ranges and thus require more training space. Increased reliance on our National Guard and Reserve Forces requires additional training which causes competition for the existing heavily used training areas.

We have recently learned the International Paper Co., is reducing its timber-harvesting operations and 12,760 acres of timberland will be available for sale. This land is immediately adjacent to the overcrowded, overused training area at Fort Bragg and shares 7.8 miles of the reservation's Little River boundary.

The opportunity to purchase a single, large parcel of land for the necessary expansion of one of our military installations is rare indeed. The price proposed in this amendment is a fair market value for the land. It behooves us to act quickly rather than wait 1 year for a routine project request and run the risk of having the land lost by sale to private developers.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Simply in the interest of time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the gentleman offered this amendment again after the committee met. The subcommittee subsequently met, reviewed all of the amendments, including the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. ROSE, and we have no objection to the amendment and urge that it be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—NAVY

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California, $530,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, $6,905,000.

Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center, Bridgeport, California, $1,470,000.

Marine Corps Camp Detachment, Camp Elmore, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,995,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $24,140,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, $25,175,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Camp Pendleton, California, $14,310,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $36,450,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, $30,375,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, $17,420,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, $10,780,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, $3,610,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, $17,970,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, $22,670,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, $7,060,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $14,700,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $28,900,000.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE NAVY

Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, $2,940,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, $1,880,000.

Naval Space Command, Dahlgren, Virginia, $4,700,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $10,300,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, Lewisville, Arkansas, $675,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, Mayport, Florida, $470,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, $13,000,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, North Island, California, $585,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,880,000.

Intelligence Center, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Commandant Naval District, Washington, District of Columbia, $6,300,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, $3,040,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, $29,835,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $9,960,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, $5,800,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, $16,370,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, $10,820,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, $365,000.

Naval Station, New York, New York, $86,260,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,675,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $800,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, $16,940,000.

Naval Facility, Radio Island, North Carolina, $17,640,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, $2,650,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, $8,650,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington, $5,200,000.

Amphibious Task Force, Camp Pendleton, California, $9,020,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $16,150,000.

Naval Station, Everett, Washington, $17,640,000.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, $36,500,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, $2,300,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, $17,230,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $385,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, $18,593,000.

Commander, Oceanographic System, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,180,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, $16,197,000.

Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, California, $14,120,000.

Naval Station Mare Island, Vallejo, California, $735,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, $2,650,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Fleet and Mine Warfare Training Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,180,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Coronado, California, $9,330,000.

Surface Warfare Officers School Command Detachment, Coronado, California, $5,200,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, $4,360,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, $9,640,000.

Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal School, Eglin, Florida, $13,700,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, $20,740,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,460,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia, $420,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, $11,695,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, $450,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut, $13,300,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $19,580,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, $9,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, $225,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, $5,670,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, California, $4,800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $7,850,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $305,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California, $4,750,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $2,900,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, California, $1,570,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, $810,000.

NAVAL MILITARY PERSONNEL COMMAND

Navy Band, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,900,000.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Medical Clinic, Annapolis, Maryland, $12,540,000.

Naval Hospital, Groton, Connecticut, $8,720,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida, $18,600,000.

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, $6,300,000.

Naval Hospital, Oak Harbor, Washington, $13,900,000.

Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Florida, $7,250,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, $24,980,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, $30,945,000.

Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington, $1,520,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $4,070,000.

Polaris Missile Facility, Atlantic, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,620,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $17,620,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, $9,315,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, $3,720,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,550,000.

Naval Ordance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, $1,570,000.

Naval Supply Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $1,555,000.

Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, Washington, $2,440,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia, $388,360,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst, New Jersey, $600,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, $7,160,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, Kentucky, $16,950,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia, $13,080,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $2,350,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island, California, $9,465,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, $7,890,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,860,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $13,700,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida, $8,430,000.

Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, $10,200,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, $23,650,000.

Naval Ship Weapon Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California, $10,780,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, $3,255,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, $6,690,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, San Diego, California, $27,450,000.

Naval Supply Center, San Diego, California, $7,100,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity, Saint Inigoes, Maryland, $15,550,000.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, $5,915,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, $4,220,000.

Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown, Virginia, $4,120,000.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

Naval Oceanography Command Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, $390,000.

Naval Western Oceanography Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $4,500,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Radio Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, $785,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska, $980,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Northwest, Chesapeake, Virginia, $1,385,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California, $395,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, $3,280,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan, $1,775,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa, Japan, $2,990,000.

Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan, $2,250,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada, $700,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, $22,410,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $1,270,000.

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $7,100,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $14,700,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Navy Support Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $16,530,000.

Naval Air Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $22,450,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, $11,270,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, $6,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, $10,200,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, $990,000.

Naval Magazine, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $250,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $13,270,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Naval Activities, London, United Kingdom, $7,635,000.

Naval Support Activity, Naples, Italy, $7,750,000.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy, $5,930,000.

Personnel Support Activity, London, United Kingdom, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, $1,080,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Yokosuka, Japan, $4,400,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communication Area Master Station, Western Pacific, Guam, $8,945,000.

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, $2,690,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Detachment, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $3,700,000.

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Various Locations, $980,000.

SEC. 202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Naval Air Station, Adak, Alaska, one hundred units, $15,500,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, two hundred and eighty-two units, $29,800,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, one hundred units, $8,400,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, two hundred units, $15,200,000.

Fleet Training Group Pacific, Warner Springs, California, forty-four units, $4,400,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, two hundred units, $15,400,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, one unit, $170,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, three hundred units, $24,180,000.

(b) NAVAL PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct the two hundred housing units authorized by subsection (a) for the Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, at Telegraph Point or at any other suitable and appropriate site.

SEC. 203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $34,020,000.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, three hundred seventy-two units, $17,610,000.

Naval air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, one unit, $56,500.

SEC. 204. TRANSIENT HOUSING UNITS, CHINHAE, KOREA

The Secretary of the Navy may convert the four existing transient housing units contained in Building 706 in Chinhae, Korea, to family housing units.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, $28,280,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, $41,699,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, California, $63,129,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, $7,350,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $33,100,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $21,890,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $2,500,000.
Edwards Air Force Base, California, $7,250,000.
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, $14,560,000.
Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, $27,150,000.
Sunnyvale Air Force Station, California, $2,700,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Billy Mitchell Field, Wisconsin, $500,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Buckley Air National Guard Base, Colorado, $12,370,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, $1,730,000.
Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, $29,950,000.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $10,500,000.
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, $22,750,000.
Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, $1,900,000.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, $6,850,000.
Mather Air Force Base, California, $2,700,000.
Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $3,200,000.
Reese Air Force Base, Texas, $3,250,000.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, $16,150,000.
Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $4,210,000.
Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, $660,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama, $6,000,000.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $12,000,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Attu Research Site, Alaska, $910,000.
Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, $44,950,000.
Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, $5,000,000.
King Salmon Airport, Alaska, $8,600,000.
Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska, $45,900,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $13,160,000.
Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $10,120,000.
Base 24, Classified Location, $6,170,000.
Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, $250,000.
Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, $1,620,000.
Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, $3,090,000.
Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Florida, $1,700,000.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $60,330,000.
McChord Air Force Base, Washington, $2,240,000.
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $16,100,000.
Norton Air Force Base, California, $4,570,000.
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, $440,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $17,150,000.
Travis Air Force Base, California, $10,300,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, $480,000.
Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii, $5,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Cape Cod Air Force Station, Massachusetts, $600,000.
Cavalier Air Force Station, North Dakota, $950,000.
Clear Air Force Station, Alaska $4,500,000.
Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $5,200,000.

SPECIAL PROJECT

Various Locations, $55,000,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, $1,400,000.
Base 34, Classified Location, $8,920,000.
Beale Air Force Base, California, $6,950,000.
Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, $4,080,000.
Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, $4,260,000.
Carswell Air Force Base, Texas $3,150,000.
Castle Air Force Base, California $3,300,000.
Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $16,950,000.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, $72,064,000.
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, $12,500,000.
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, $12,550,000.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, $62,730,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, $2,740,000.
Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, $1,700,000.
K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, $22,580,000.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, $1,300,000.
March Air Force Base, California, $9,000,000.
McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, $71,490,000.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, $5,000,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, $4,740,000.
Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, $1,200,000.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, $1,050,000.
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, $1,960,000.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, $4,650,000.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, $5,300,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, $770,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, $8,230,000.
England Air Force Base, Louisiana, $4,900,000.
George Air Force Base, California, $12,640,000.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $16,850,000.
Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, $7,015,000.
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, $8,680,000.
Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, $14,780,000.
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, $8,850,000.
Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, $24,030,000.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $14,600,000.
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $430,000.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, $17,860,000.
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, $2,320,000.
Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, $13,300,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, $8,780,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Air Force Academy, Colorado, $10,310,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Lajes Field, Portugal, $25,285,000.
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $11,600,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Camp Zama, Japan, $1,500,000.
Kadena Air Base, Japan, $27,650,000.
Misawa Air Base, Japan, $9,500,000.
Yokota Air Base, Japan, $13,750,000.
Kimhae Air Base, Korea, $10,400,000.
Kunsan Air Base, Korea, $9,000,000.
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea, $16,310,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, $24,510,000.
Sachon Air Base, Korea, $310,000.
Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean, $5,300,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $15,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Thule Air Base, Greenland, $12,350,000.
Sondrestrom Air Base, Greenland, $5,750,000.
GEODSS Site 5, Portugal, $14,650,000.
Pirinclik Air Station, Turkey, $2,600,000.
BMEWS Site III, Fylingdales, United Kingdom, $3,100,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Panama, $2,172,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Florennes Air Base, Belgium, $5,860,000.
Ahlhorn Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Bitburg Air Base, Germany, $9,050,000.
Einsiedlerhof, Germany, $2,900,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $8,160,000.
Hessisch Oldendorf Air Station, Germany, $1,230,000.
Kapaun Air Station, Germany, $900,000.
Leipheim Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Marienfelde Communications Station, Germany, $2,550,000.
Norvenich Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Pruem Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, $17,470,000.
Sembach Air Base, Germany, $6,460,000.
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, $14,860,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $940,000.
Vogelweh Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Wenigerath Storage Site, Germany, $1,700,000.
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany, $4,550,000.
Aviano Air Base, Italy, $5,070,000.
Comiso Air Station, Italy, $6,280,000.
Decimomannu Air Base, Italy, $2,800,000.
San Vito Air Station, Italy, $1,590,000.
Morocco, $3,100,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $2,710,000.
Keizerveer Air Base, The Netherlands, $270,000.
Vught, The Netherlands, $310,000.
Ankara Air Station, Turkey, $950,000.
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, $11,570,000.
Karatas, Turkey, $2,330,000.
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, $20,910,000.

RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, $12,050,000.

RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $1,630,000.

RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, $7,400,000.

RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $2,840,000.

RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, $10,320,000.

RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom, $8,230,000.

RAF Molesworth, United Kingdom, $21,063,000.

RAF Sculthorpe, United Kingdom, $2,350,000.

RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $4,640,000.

Various Locations, United Kingdom, $3,600,000.

Base 25, Classified Location, $4,500,000.

Base 29, Classified Location, $3,500,000.

Base 30, Classified Location, $4,830,000.

Base 33, Classified Location, $9,450,000.

Various Locations, Europe, $4,450,000.

SEC. 302. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Florennes, Belgium, four hundred units, $29,200,000.

Hahn Air Base, Germany, four hundred and forty units, $33,000,000.

Ramstein Air Base, Germany, four hundred units, $30,000,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, family housing support facilities, $1,200,000.

Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, one hundred and forty units, $11,000,000.

Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, four hundred and fifty units, $37,900,000.

Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, fifty units, $4,000,000.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $61,300,000, of which $19,939,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, twenty-four units, $1,200,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, three hundred and twenty-eight units, $12,532,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, thirty-two units, $2,873,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, one hundred and ten units, $3,724,000.

Ramstein Air Base, Germany, two hundred and eighty units, $10,279,000.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, one hundred units, $6,605,000.

Kadena Air Base, Japan, two hundred and thirty-five units, $12,163,000.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, twenty-nine units, $1,042,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KRAMER

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KRAMER: Page 35, after line 16, insert the following new subsection:

(c) IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AT PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO.—(1) To support the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out an improvement project at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, to add to and alter an existing facility and (notwithstanding section 2826 of title 10, United States Code) convert it to a family housing unit with a maximum net floor area of 3,100 square feet at a cost not to exceed $81,000.

(2) The amount of the project authorized by this subsection shall not be considered to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for functions of the Department of the Air Force.

(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term "net floor area" has the same meaning given that term by section 2826(f) of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not require any funds to be authorized in this bill in addition to what is already authorized. It is needed for the purpose of allowing the alteration of an existing facility at the Peterson Air Force Base which is necessary because of the activation of the U.S. Space Command.

I ask the House to approve the amendment.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was presented by my colleague to the chairman of the committee and other Members. During the review process, we reviewed this amendment. There is no objection to the amendment from the subcommittee or from this side of the aisle, and I understand there is no objection to the amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ATKINS

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ATKINS: Page 34, after line 8, insert the following:

Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, one hundred and sixty-three units, $14,200,000.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds no additional spending authorization to the bill. It simply allows the Air Force to proceed with its plans for building 164 units of housing at Hanscom Air Force Base in Bedford.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has reviewed the gentleman's amendment. We feel that it is meritorious and it does not add any money to the bill.

There is a family housing shortage in that particular area. What this simply does is move money from maintenance to construction to provide the opportunity for the housing to be built.

We have no objection to the amendment and accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Anchorage, Alaska, $1,390,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Alameda, California, $1,320,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Barstow, California, $825,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Pedro, California, $700,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Groton, Connecticut, $625,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Port Tampa, Florida, $595,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Fort Riley, Kansas, $965,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Newington, New Hampshire, $1,040,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Verona, New York, $1,395,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $470,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, $8,085,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Texarkana, Texas, $2,635,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, $3,825,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, $750,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, $5,355,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Richmond, Virginia, $650,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Manchester, Washington, $565,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, $1,020,000.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Repromat Secure Storage Facility, Mineral Wells, Texas, $900,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, $7,078,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Classified Location, $12,000,000.

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, $25,000,000.

Classified Location, $3,142,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Kaiserslautern, Germany, $360,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Chimu Wan, Okinawa, Japan, $8,160,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Pyongtaek, Korea, $5,820,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Uijongbu, Korea, $6,200,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Classified Locations, $7,150,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Florennes, Belgium, $7,420,000.

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, $2,290,000.

Babenhausen, Germany, $760,000.

Bamberg, Germany, $5,800,000.

Butzbach, Germany, $3,420,000.

Hanau, Germany, $7,480,000.

Heidelberg, Germany, $1,910,000.

Heilbronn, Germany, $2,520,000.

Pirmasens, Germany, $1,630,000.

Schweinfurt, Germany, $3,930,000.

Sembach Air Base, Germany, $2,170,000.

Vilseck, Germany, $6,680,000.

Sigonella, Italy, $5,360,000.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, $4,780,000.

Okinawa, Japan, $745,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, $2,780,000.

Pusan, Korea, $1,540,000.

Taegu, Korea, $730,000.

Soesterberg Air Base, Netherlands, $4,460,000.

Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $7,190,000.

Bicester, United Kingdom, $4,570,000.

Upwood, United Kingdom, $3,240,000.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, $1,060,000.

SEC. 402. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of Defense may construct or acquire twenty family housing units (including acquisition of land) at classified installations in the total amount of $1,800,000.

SEC. 403. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $110,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 38, strike out line 17.

Page 39, line 4, strike out "$745,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,000".

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the authorization for the Department of Defense overseas dependent schools by $2.735 million by deleting two elementary school projects. One is a proposed school in Bermuda which has a current cost estimate greatly in excess of the original estimate of $2.3 million. We have asked them to revise the estimate.

The other is a proposed $445,000 school in Okinawa. Because of a site change, the project should be deferred, and we are told that both projects will be resubmitted on the next fiscal year, 1987, military construction authorization budget request.

Simply to summarize, we are at this point on this amendment asking to reduce the figure by $2.7 million, and the two projects will be resubmitted in the next fiscal year military construction budget. At that time, we think the concerns that the subcommittee had with respect to these two projects will have been dealt with.

I ask that the amendment be favorably disposed of.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 605 plus the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RECURRING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,399,411,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101(a), $1,107,056,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 101(b), $451,970,000.

(3) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, $26,000,000.

(4) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $31,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $136,100,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $356,491,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $1,290,794,000, of which not more than $1,520,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $132,047,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE I.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and $73,000,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Eastern Distribution Center, New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,602,234,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 201(a), $1,521,450,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 201(b), $178,265,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $21,560,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $139,260,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $2,960,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $154,000,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $584,739,000, of which not more than $3,545,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $18,934,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE II.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 201 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 603. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,809,561,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 301(a), $1,224,617,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 301(b), $446,710,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $22,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $144,096,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $30,240,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $212,600,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $729,298,000, of which not more than $2,711,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $45,402,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE III.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 604. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $205,760,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 401(a), $53,132,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 401(b), $95,928,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(4) For construction projects contingency construction authority of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $5,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $27,400,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $1,910,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $18,390,000, of which not more than $14,933,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1986 for military construction functions of the Defense Agencies that remain available for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for military construction projects authorized in section 401 in the amount of $42,025,000.

(c) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE IV.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 401 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and the amount specified in subsection (b).

SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of construction projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure Program, as authorized by section 501, in the amount of $55,000,000.

SEC. 606. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS; EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER TWO YEARS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all authorizations contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor contained in sections 601 through 605) shall expire on October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) do not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later, for construction contracts, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program.

(b) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1984 PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 607(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 780), authorizations for the following projects authorized in sections 101, 201, and 301 of that Act shall remain in effect until October 1, 1986, or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, whichever is later:

(1) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,850,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(2) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,750,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(3) Range modernization in the amount of $2,450,000 at Wildflecken, Germany.

(4) Unaccompanied personnel housing in the amount of $1,400,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(5) Operations building in the amount of $370,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(6) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $480,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(7) Unaccompanied Officer housing in the amount of $600,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(8) Operations building in the amount of $410,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(9) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $620,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(10) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Elefsis, Greece.

(11) Operations control center in the amount of $7,800,000 at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine.

(12) Engine test cell modifications in the amount of $1,180,000 at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida.

(13) Land acquisition in the amount of $830,000 at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California.

(14) Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing in the amount of $10,000,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida.

(15) Electrical distribution lines in the amount of $7,200,000 at the Naval Shipyard Mare Island, Vallejo, California.

(16) Family housing in the amount of $33,982,000 at RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom.

(17) Air freight terminal in the amount of $10,200,000 at Elmendorf, Alaska.

SEC. 607. ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

For projects or contracts initiated during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1, 1985, whichever is later, and ending on the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 or October 1, 1986, whichever is later, the following amounts apply:

(1) The maximum amount for an unspecified minor military construction project under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is $1,000,000.

(2) The amount of a contract for architectural and engineering services or construction design that makes such a contract subject to the reporting requirement under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, is $300,000.

(3) The maximum amount per unit for an improvement project for family housing

units under section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is $30,000.

(4) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam under section 2828(b) of title 10, United States Code, is $10,000.

(5)(A) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is $16,800.

(B) The maximum number of family housing units that may be leased at any one time in foreign countries under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is 34,000.

(6) The maximum rental per year for family housing facilities, or for real property related to family housing facilities, leased in a foreign country under section 2828(f) of title 10, United States Code, is $250,000.

SEC. 608. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 40, line 20, strike out "$3,399,411,000" and insert in lieu thereof $3,410,786,000".

Page 40, line 23, strike out "$1,107,056,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,120,111,000".

Page 41, line 3, strike out "$451,970,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$450,290,000".

Page 41, line 21, strike out "$1,520,000" and insert in lieu thereof "2,520,000".

Page 41, line 25, strike out "$132,047,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$131,047,000".

Page 42, line 12, insert the following before the period: ", and $101,000,000 (the amount authorized under section 101(b) for Various Locations, Germany)".

Page 45, line 6, strike out "$212,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$226,800,000".

Page 45, line 10, strike out "$729,298,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$715,098,000".

Page 46, line 8, strike out "$205,760,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$203,025,000".

Page 46, line 14, strike out "$95,928,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$93,193,000".

Page 49, line 10, strike out "and 301" and insert in lieu thereof "301, and 401".

Page 51, insert the following after line 2:

(18) Sewage system in the amount of $2,760,000 at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

(19) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Fort Hunter Liggett, California.

(20) Child care center in the amount of $3,000,000 at Fort Polk, Louisiana.

(21) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $2,200,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California.

(22) Special Process Laboratories Building in the amount of $39,100,000 at Fort Meade, Maryland.

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a technical and conforming amendment in nature. It corrects clerical and printing errors in the bill. It brings title VI, which authorizes appropriations, in conformance with the other titles and extends certain prior-year authorizations to allow the military departments additional time to award projects, award contracts on projects that have been delayed for various reasons. This amendment changes no substantive provisions, and I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VII.

The text of title VII is as follows:

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION FOR GUARD AND RESERVE FACILITIES.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States, $142,624,000, and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $66,289,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $61,800,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $137,200,000, and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $70,650,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONTGOMERY: Page 53, line 5, strike out "$142,624,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$145,924,000".

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide for authorization of funds to acquire land to expand the training area at Camp McCain in my home State of Mississippi. Camp McCain is an Army National Guard training site where Army Guard units from Mississippi and several surrounding States conduct weapons and maneuver training each year.

Due to the limited training area currently available at Camp McCain, any firing of weapons larger than 30 caliber requires travel to other training sites resulting in great expense to the Government. In addition to solving the weapons firing problems, this new acquisition will provide terrain badly needed for maneuver areas for the new M-1 tank already deployed at Camp McCain because the tanks can now be used only for stationary training, soldiers are experiencing loss of proficiency in their driving and firing-while-moving skills.

Although I considered doing so, I did not offer this project for consideration during committee markup because the required environmental studies had not been completed. These studies have since been completed and I have been advised that there has been a finding of "no significant impact."

Thus, there no longer seems to be any reason for delaying this land acquisition. The land owners are willing to sell at this time and, in fact, are wanting to know why the purchase is being delayed. The Army estimates that savings derived from this purchase will pay for the land in less than 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this will prove to be a very cost-effective expenditure of funds. Apparently, members of the Appropriations Committee feel the same since the funds for this project have been included in the fiscal year 86 military construction appropriations bill as reported, "subject to appropriations."

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was submitted after the committee carried out its responsibilities to mark up. The subcommittee reviewed the matter and agreed to support the gentleman's amendment. We have no objection and urge its approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MC DADE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDADE: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $7,565,000 for facilities at Scranton/Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania,".

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I had to present for the consideration of the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member after the committee had completed its deliberations. It involves an effort to solve a safety problem that exists because the National

Guard has decided to put a new helicopter unit in the State of Pennsylvania. The current facilities are not adequate to assure that the safety of the young men who must fly and maintain these choppers would be adequate unless we provide additional facilities.

I have discussed this with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and I have discussed it as well with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER]. I am not aware of any objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. McDADE. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from California, my friend.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleagues for yielding.

The Chair would like to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman did present this amendment. In fact, it was right after the markup. The gentleman was very concerned and raised an important safety matter. As a matter of fact, as I understand, some people lost their lives as a result of this situation.

The gentleman also presented the amendment to the minority side. When the Chair convened a meeting of the full subcommittee to review all amendments, the gentleman's amendment was reviewed and the subcommittee agreed to accept the gentleman's amendment. So it is not only this side, but the entire subcommittee sees the gentleman's amendment as meritorous, and we ask it be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEVILL

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEVILL: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $2,671,000 for facilities at various locations in Alabama,".

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, this is an authorization for four Army National Guard armories to be included in the bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] as well as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] and myself have consolidated this amendment for the three congressional districts involved.

The Alabama Military Department points out that these are badly needed. I have discussed them with the chairman and the ranking minority member, and as far as I know, there is no objection. As a matter of fact, we did not have the design already at the time the markup was held. The design is ready now, and Alabama is ready to make its local participation, which, as I understand it, is 25 percent.

So I urge the committee to adopt the amendment.

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

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

□ 1520

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, the chair would like to point out that this amendment also was reviewed by the subcommittee, and the members agreed to support and accept the gentleman's amendment. We have no objection to the amendment on this side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $2,186,000 for facilities located in Missouri,".

Mr. SKELTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, without further explanation, I have discussed this with the chairman. It deals with the DISCOM headquarters in Jefferson City, MO, Lexington, MO.

I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was reviewed by the members of the subcommittee. The members chose to support the amendment. We have no objection to it and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS: Page 53, line 11, strike out "$137,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$139,000,000".

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to winterize the dormitories at Phelps Collins Air National Guard Base in Alpena, MI. This is the kind of wise use of our precious defense resources that I know the American taxpayer would support as well as an opportunity to positively effect defense readiness.

Phelps Collins ANG has been used for Guard training since 1953. It has an excellent reputation as an air training facility, but suffers from some deficiencies in its buildings.

The biggest problem revolves around its dormitories, which are not properly winterized. While Phelps Collins is a hustling, bustling center of activity during the warm weather months, training slows to a crawl during the winter. Northern Michigan winters make it prohibitive to use dormitories that are not insulated. If these dormitories were insulated, the Air National Guard would have additional training facilities that would increase Phelps Collins year-around capacity from 6,000 to an estimated 10,000 personnel annually. In other words, for a relatively small amount of money we could increase this important facility's usefulness by almost double. It is rare when we are given an opportunity to get that much bang for our military buck.

There is another important point that should be considered. There are only four permanent Air Guard training sites in the country, and if there is no room for units to train here, units must be deployed overseas for training. While there are some obvious benefits from sending a unit overseas for training, there is also one great disadvantage—cost. If, by winterizing Phelps Collins, we can keep one unit from having to train overseas, we can probably save enough money to immediately offset this $1.8 million outlay. A side benefit, of course, is that the economic impact which accompanies an activity such as this occurs here in this country rather than overseas.

Phelps Collins plays an important part in our total defense mission. It is a frequently used, popular site for guardsmen from all over the country. In one case, Phelps Collins played host to 59 F-15's and 1,300 personnel from the 1st Tactical Fighter Wing from Langley Air Force Base, VA. My amendment today is an important opportunity to add substantially to Phelps Collins capabilities.

Mr Chairman, I urge the adoption of this important amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman said, this amendment entails a relatively small amount of money. It deals with a weatherizing program in an area that needs it, and members of the subcommittee believe that the gentleman's amendment is a meritorious one, and we have no objection to the amendment and would urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDSON: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $755,000 for a facility in New Mexico,".

Mr. RICHARDSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend my colleagues, Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. KRAMER for their hard work on this legislation. Their efforts are appreciated by us all. I am offering an amendment to H.R. 1409 today for Mr. SKEEN and myself to authorize an additional $755,000 for the construction of an Army armory in Hobbs, NM.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to offer an amendment authorizing additional funds for anything at this time when we are giving such careful consideration to all budget requests. In this instance, however, I feel the ultimate result will mean a savings—rather than a deficit—to the Federal Treasury.

Earlier this year, the State of New Mexico, in reasonable anticipation of receiving Federal funds for much-needed improvements at three New Mexico armories, appropriated matching funds of 25 percent for each facility under consideration. The New Mexico Legislature appropriated $299,000 for the facility to be built outside of Hobbs. Believing it had clear assurances from the Federal Government on this project, the State proceeded to expend $15,604 on architect/engineer services for the proposed facility. The Federal Government also spent $29,000 to complete the design phase of the project—as clear an indication as I know that all signals were go for the Hobbs Armory.

On top of these compelling facts, the proposed armory just outside of Hobbs is scheduled to replace two existing armories which are in such a state of disrepair, the construction of one new facility will cost less than the renovation and operation of the two armories in the area. This proposed consolidation move is part of an overall effort by the Guard to improve efficiency and effectiveness at its armories—the National Guard anticipates a net savings in the long term as a result of the consolidation of the two existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, even if funds are not appropriated for this facility, there is a slim chance that it could receive funds if, for some reason, additional funds become available at DOD over the course of the fiscal year—but only if the project is authorized by us today.

Obviously, everyone is ready to proceed on this project—the State has appropriated the matching funds, the plans are complete, the initial investment has been made by both the State and the Federal Government and, most importantly, the National Guard in New Mexico is in desperate need of new facilities. The project was not dropped from the DOD budget request for lack of need—need is clearly indicated in all plans and studies. It was dropped from the DOD military construction request simply because not enough funds were anticipated to meet military construction needs in fiscal year 1986. While we are hoping DOD will come back with a request for fiscal year 1987, we are uncertain whether the State matching funds will still be around to supplement the building of the facility.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which is important to both New Mexico and the training and military preparedness of our national guardsmen.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman explained, this is a project that has already received priority in that it was scheduled to be in the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1987.

The gentleman presented the subcommittee with a number of reasons why that program ought to be moved from fiscal year 1987 to fiscal year 1986, and the subcommittee sees no objection to it. We would urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VIII.

The text of title VIII is as follows:

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PILOT PROGRAMS.

(a) BUILD-TO-LEASE PROGRAM.—Paragraph (9) of section 2828(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

(b) RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAM.—Subsection (h) of section 802 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 783, 789), is amended by striking out "September 30, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

SEC. 802. FAMILY HOUSING OCCUPANT LIABILITY.

(a) LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO CLEAN SATISFACTORILY.—Subsection (a) of section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) A member of the armed forces—

"(A) who is assigned or provided a family housing unit; and

"(B) who fails to clean satisfactorily that housing unit (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense) upon termination of the assignment or provision of that housing unit,

shall be liable to the United States for the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of that failure.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting "(in the case of liability under subsection (a)(1))" after "including".

(2) Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking out "subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(1), or the cost of any cleaning made necessary by a failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit referred to in subsection (a)(2),".

(3) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "or failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit" after "(or the equipment or furnishings of a family housing unit)".

(4) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall include—

"(1) regulations for determining the cost of repairs and replacements made necessary as the result of abuse or negligence for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(1);

"(2) regulations for determining the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of the failure to clean satisfactorily for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(2); and

"(3) provisions for limitations of liability, the compromise or waiver of claims, and the collection of amounts owed under this section.".

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing".

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 165 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing.".

SEC. 803. PREOCCUPANCY TERMINATION COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; and

(2) by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) The Secretary may enter into an agreement under this paragraph in connection with a lease entered into under subsection (c). Any such agreement shall be for any period not in excess of three years and shall be for the purpose of compensating a developer for any costs resulting from the termination of the lease during the construction of the housing units that are to be occupied pursuant to the lease. Any agreement entered into under this paragraph shall include a provision that the obligation of the United States to make payments under the

agreement in any fiscal year is subject to the availability of appropriations.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 804. ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF FAMILY HOUSING.—Section 2821 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Amounts authorized by law for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities include amounts for—

"(1) minor construction;

"(2) improvements to existing military family housing units and facilities;

"(3) relocation of military family housing units under section 2827 of this title; and

"(4) architectural and engineering services and construction design.".

(b) FAMILY HOUSING SUPPORT.—(1) Chapter 169 of such title is amended by adding after section 2832 the following new section:

"§ 2833. Family housing support

"Amounts authorized by law for support of military family housing include amounts for—

"(1) operating expenses;

"(2) leasing expenses;

"(3) maintenance of real property expenses;

"(4) payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred; and

"(5) payments of mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m).".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2832 the following new item:

"2833. Family housing support.".

SEC. 805. DOMESTIC FAMILY HOUSING LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "(3) Not" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not"; and

(2) by adding the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(B) During fiscal years 1986 and 1987, the number of housing units that may be leased pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (A) may be increased by 500 units for each such fiscal year. The Secretary concerned shall provide written notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the location, purpose, and cost of the additional units permitted by this subparagraph. Such notification shall be made periodically as the leases are entered into.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 806. SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.—Section 807(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law No. 98.115; 97 Stat. 786), is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1986".

(b) APPROVAL OF TRANSACTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out the following sale-and-replacement transactions under the provisions of section 2667a of title 10, United States Code:

(1) The sale and replacement of warehousing facilities at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

(2) The sale and replacement of a noncommissioned officers professional education center, a band center, and a combat operations center at March Air Force Base, California.

SEC. 807. TURN-KEY SELECTION PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter III the following new section:

"§ 2862. Turn-key selection procedures

"(a)(1) The Secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, may use one-step turn-key selection procedures for the purpose of entering into contracts for the construction of authorized military construction projects.

"(2) In this section, 'one-step turn-key selection procedures' means procedures used for the selection of a contractor on the basis of price and other evaluation criteria to perform, in accordance with the provisions of a firm fixed-price contract, both the design and construction of a facility using performance specifications supplied by the Secretary concerned.

"(b) The Secretary of a military department may not, during any fiscal year, enter into more than three contracts for military construction projects using procedures authorized by this section.

"(c) The authority of a Secretary of a military department under this section shall expire on October 1, 1991.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2861 the following:

"2862. Turn-key selection procedures.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 808. COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of Defense may use funds appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for planning and design purposes to provide community planning assistance when local resources are not sufficient, by grant or otherwise, as follows:

(1) To assist communities located near newly established Light Infantry Division Posts, $2,000,000.

(2) To assist communities located near newly established homeports under the Naval Strategic Dispersal Program, $3,000,000.

SEC. 809. MADIGAN ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, FORT LEWIS WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1512), is amended by striking out "and the amount specified in subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the amount specified in subsection (b)(1), and $326,800,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, Washington)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 810. INTERSERVICE EXCHANGES.

Section 2571 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No agency or official of the executive branch of the Federal Government may establish any regulation, program, or policy or take any other action which precludes, directly or indirectly, the Secretaries concerned from carrying out this section.".

SEC. 811. PLAN FOR CLEANUP OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall develop and transmit, by December 31, 1985, to the Congress a report setting forth a comprehensive plan for completing the cleanup of contaminated sites, structures, equipment, and natural resources at or near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, Colorado, by September 30, 1993.

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—In such plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) describe in detail the various phases for the project, along with the completion dates and a priority ranking of the goals for each such phase;

(2) provide cost estimates for each such phase and for the total project;

(3) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of consultation, before the transmittal of the plan, with State and local officials (including officials of water districts) and the general public;

(4) provide that consultation and coordination with such officials and the general public will be carried out throughout the process of cleaning up the Arsenal;

(5) provide for priority cleanup of—

(A) the most seriously contaminated areas at the Arsenal, including the areas known as Basin F, Basin A, and section 36;

(B) other areas at the Arsenal which should be afforded priority treatment for the benefit of the general public, including the areas known as sections 7, 8, 11, and 12; and

(C) any sites, structures, equipment, or natural resources located outside the Arsenal that have been contaminated by activities carried out at the Arsenal;

(6) provide for the cleanup of the areas described in paragraph (5) without regard to whether a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal has been selected;

(7) establish, as a priority, the use of waste-treatment technologies that will reduce significantly the amount and toxicity level of hazardous substances at or near the Arsenal;

(8) provide for selection of a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal in a manner that will take into consideration sites, within and outside of Colorado, that—

(A) are geologically suitable to serve as such a disposal site; and

(B) are located within areas the governing bodies of which have expressed a willingness to have such a disposal site located therein;

(9) provide that all activities in the plan will be carried out in compliance with the requirements of applicable Federal and State environmental laws, but, in the case of State laws, only to the extent that such laws are in effect on May 15, 1985;

(10) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of studying the feasibility and cost of cleansing groundwater on an expedited basis at the sources of contamination on the Arsenal; and

(11) include a statement concerning any reprogramming or supplemental appropriation of funds that may be necessary for fiscal year 1986 in order to assure an expeditious implementation of the plan.

SEC. 812. PROJECT AMOUNT FOR FORT DRUM, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount established for a project at Fort Drum, New York, by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1495) is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(b) FUNDING.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1985 for military construction functions of the Army that remain available

for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, for the military construction project described in subsection (a), in the amount of $82,500,000.

(c) COST OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the limit established by section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, on the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 of that Act is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 813. MATERIAL AT NAVAL BASE, NORFOLK, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary of the Navy may provide, without compensation, to the City of Norfolk, Virginia, not more than 50,000 cubic yards of dredged material located at the Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia, if such city agrees to bear all costs and liabilities associated with loading, transporting, using, or otherwise handling such material.

SEC. 814. LAND CONVEYANCE TO THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE; COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Air Force (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the United States Olympic Committee, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 3.98 acres of land and improvements near Colorado Springs, Colorado, that are being leased to such Committee by the Secretary pursuant to section 806 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1980.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance described in subsection (a) shall be subject—

(1) to the condition that the land and improvements so conveyed shall be used by the United States Olympic Committee solely for facilities and activities of such Committee;

(2) to the condition that if such land and improvements are not used for the purpose described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to them shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon; and

(3) to such other conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact description of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 815. ALTERATION IN TRAILER PARK EXPANSION, HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In providing for the trailer park at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, and the expansion of such park as authorized by section 302 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, the Secretary of the Air Force may enter into an agreement with the Massachusetts Port Authority to terminate leasehold rights of the Department of the Air Force in exchange for—

(1) leasehold rights to other land held by such Authority; and

(2) the construction, by such Authority or its designee, of roads, utilities, and trailer pads on such other land in accordance with specifications made by the Secretary.

(b) LIMITATION.—The termination of the leasehold rights by the Secretary shall not become effective until the completion of the construction described in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 816. TRANSFERS CONCERNING THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

(a) TRANSFER TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—The Administrator of General Services shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Army a tract (with any improvements thereon) of 18.5 acres (more or less) adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia.

(b) TRANSFER BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—Upon the relocation of the Army Intelligence and Security Command and other defense activities from Arlington Hall Station to new quarters, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer, without reimbursement, approximately 72 acres of the tract of land known as Arlington Hall Station, together with improvements thereon, to the Secretary of State to be used as a center for training in foreign affairs, and for other purposes as deemed appropriate by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 817. LAND EXCHANGE, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) through (f), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the NEW MET Company (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Company") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 39.5 acres of unimproved land comprising a portion of the Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, located adjacent to the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance by the Secretary under subsection (a), the Company shall convey to the United States a parcel of land consisting of approximately 31.7 acres located in the vicinity of the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Company are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties dated February 19, 1985.

(d) PAYMENT BY THE COMPANY.—If the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Company shall pay the difference to the United States.

(e) SURVEY.—The exact acreages and legal descriptions of the lands to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys which are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Company.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the transaction authorized by this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 818. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Subject to subsections (b) through (g), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the Westvaco Corporation (the principal address and place of business of which is 299 Park Avenue, New York, New York, and hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Corporation") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 47.83 acres of improved land comprising that portion of the Navy Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, located at Remount Road and Virginia Avenue, in the city of North Charleston.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance authorized by subsection (a), the Corporation shall pay all costs for construction and occupancy by the Navy of "in kind" facilities to replace those on the land to be conveyed. The replacement facilities shall be constructed by the Navy on the Naval Weapons Station described in subsection (a) at a site to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Corporation are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties that became effective April 17, 1985. The Secretary is authorized to receive, obligate, and disburse funds received under subsection (b) to cover design, construction, relocation, and related costs specified in the memorandum of understanding.

(d) VACATING PROPERTY.—Upon completion and occupancy of the replacement facilities by the Navy and payment of all costs by the Corporation, the Navy shall promptly vacate the property described in subsection (a) and convey it by quitclaim deed to the Corporation.

(e) PAYMENT OF ANY EXCESS.—If the fair market value of the improved land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the consideration paid under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Corporation shall pay the difference to the United States.

(f) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of any land conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey which is satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such survey shall be borne by the Corporation.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 59, line 5, strike out "Section" and insert in lieu thereof "Effective as of September 30, 1985, section".

Page 64, line 20, strike out "1985" and insert in lieu thereof "1986".

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is strictly technical in nature; it simply corrects clerical and printing errors in the bill; it changes no substantive provision. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITEHURST

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITEHURST: Page 54, line 13, strike out "Secretary of De-

fense" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy".

Page 54, after line 17, insert the following:

(b) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.—Section 2775 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by inserting after "the Secretary of Defense" the following: "and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy"; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting after "or defense agency concerned" the following: ", or the operating expenses account of the Coast Guard, as appropriate".

Page 54, line 18, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

Page 55, line 7, insert after "Defense" the following: ", and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy,".

Page 55, line 21, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

Mr. WHITEHURST (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would extend authority for the Secretary of Transportation to collect for damages to Government-furnished quarters and related equipment and furnishings administered by the Coast Guard. The current law authorizes the Department of Defense to collect for damages to quarters controlled by the Department and to credit the funds collected to the family housing and operational account of the appropriate service. The Department of Transportation does not have that same authority with respect to the Coast Guard. To date, the Coast Guard has had to absorb annual losses of approximately $70,000 due to this oversight.

I consider this as really a conforming amendment since the existing language of section 2775 technically includes the Coast Guard, and my amendment would merely clarify that the Secretary of Transportation could take action with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITEHURST. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST] is a very diligent and hard-working member of the subcommittee; one of the senior members of the full Committee on Armed Services. He offered this amendment; we reviewed the amendment to make certain that we were within our appropriate committee jurisdiction, and the way the amendment is written and presented, Mr. Chairman, it conforms with the jurisdiction. We have no objection, and urge its approval.

Mr. WHITEHURST. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL GUARD ARMORIES.

(a) CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES.—Subsection (e) of section 2233 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure, or contribute to any State such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary to procure, architectural and engineering services and construction design in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law."

(b) AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Subsection (b) of section 2236 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(b) A contribution made for an armory under section 2233(a) (4) or (5) of this title may not exceed the sum of—

"(1) 100 percent of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services (including advance architectural, engineering and design services under section 2233(e) of this title); and

"(2) a percentage of the cost of construction (exclusive of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services) calculated so that upon completion of construction the total contribution (including the contribution for architectural, engineering and design services) equals 75 percent of the total cost of construction (including the cost of architectural, engineering and design services).

For the purpose of computing the cost of construction under this subsection, the amount contributed by the State or Territory, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned, may not include the cost or market value of any real property that it has contributed."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

Mr. SKELTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to permit the Secretary of Defense to advance to a State in connection with a contribution under section 2233 of title X for the construction of National Guard facilities, 100 percent of that cost of architectural, engineering and design services related to the construction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that this proposed amendment would break the logjam that now exists by permitting the Secretary of Defense to advance 100 percent of the cost for architectural, engineering and design services for these projects such as armories and the like. It would not change the present, overall cost-sharing ratio of 75/25 percent.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment adds no additional funds to the amendment. It is a language change amendment, the authority to advance Federal funds for architect and engineering services for design of National Guard armories on a reimbursable basis.

The subcommittee has reviewed the gentleman's amendment and believes the language is meritorious and we urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I wish to engage the chairman in a short colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Missouri delegation are interested in a project in the St. Louis area, and I raise this issue because my colleague and friend, Congressman YOUNG from the St. Louis area is presently out of the country on business at this time, and there is the proposed project of renovating and putting back in better mobilization state the facility to manufacture ammunition in the St. Louis area, and I wish to direct this to the chairman; I know he is familiar with it, and would appreciate his comments at this time.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the well-being of my colleague's interest, who happens to be out of the country on important business.

Our staff has conversed with the gentleman's staff; and we have learned that the gentleman is prepared to submit the project in fiscal year 1987, and we have assured the gentleman that his request will receive serious consideration and hopefully be incorporated into the fiscal year 1987 military construction budget.

So we appreciate the gentleman's concern, as we understand that his prerogatives are being preserved, and we will simply move it back to next year's authorization bill.

Mr. SKELTON. That is certainly fine. I appreciate the gentleman's con-

sideration and his understanding on this issue.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANIEL: At the end of the title VIII (page 71, after line 9) add the following new section:

SEC. 819. FURNISHING OF BEDDING FOR HOMELESS.

Section 2546 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

"(d) The Secretary concerned may provide bedding for support of shelters for the homeless that are operated by entities other than the Department of Defense. Bedding may be provided under this subsection without reimbursement, but may only be provided to the extent that the Secretary determines that the provision of such bedding will not interfere with military requirements.".

Mr. DANIEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1530

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, as the Members will recall, 2 years ago I offered a floor amendment to the Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (sec. 305, Public Law 98-94) giving the Secretary of Defense authority to assist efforts to provide shelter for the homeless. Specifically, it authorized the Secretary of Defense to repair and rehabilitate Department of Defense [DOD] facilities to make them more suitable for use as shelters. In addition, my amendment gave DOD the authority to spend money to provide transportation, bedding, utilities, security and insurance incidental to the establishment of a shelter.

Since that time, some progress has been made. Eight shelters have been opened and negotiations are underway for seven more. Altogether, DOD has spent over $1.7 million and this level of funding will steadily increase as the program becomes more established in the years ahead.

At the same time, however, I have been somewhat concerned about the lack of progress at some sites due to the reluctance of communities and charitable organizations to operate available facilities as shelters for the homeless. For example, DOD spent $200,000 to rehabilitate a barracks at Camp Parks, CA, but repeated efforts to find a qualified party to operate a shelter there have been unsuccessful. I think it is important to remember that DOD can only be a partner in these efforts. DOD can provide the facilities and pay some of the support costs, but DOD cannot manage or operate the shelters. This partnership can only work if communities and charitable organizations are willing to come forth with the assistance and effort needed to make an available facility into a functioning shelter.

The amendment I am offering today addresses an effort by DOD to increase its assistance of the homeless. For some time, DOD has been providing cots and blankets to non-DOD shelters on the basis of a temporary loan. Currently, DOD has about 2,000 cots and 4,000 blankets on loan to various shelters around the country.

By law, DOD cannot provide cots and blankets outright and this creates a number of problems. First, a temporary loan of cots or blankets is patently unrealistic and DOD does not expect to have these items returned after use by the homeless. Second, the accounting process involved with a temporary loan results in a lot of unnecessary red tape. For example, every 90 days, the Defense Logistics Agency is required to send out inspectors to verify the need to continue the loan. In addition, the stock fund carries these items as "open items" requiring reimbursement, but it is not legal to reimburse the stock fund from the O&M account for this purpose.

My amendment would remedy this situation by authorizing DOD to provide bedding to non-DOD shelters on a nonreimbursable basis. This will eliminate the need for "temporary loans" of these items and the resulting unnecessary bookkeeping and redtape. Finally, it will allow the O&M account to reimburse the stock fund for the cots and blankets provided so that they can be replaced with newer items.

In sum, my amendment supports DOD efforts to provide cots and blankets to non-DOD shelters as "free issue" items to the extent that it does not interfere with military requirements. Cold weather is almost upon us and the adoption of my amendment will insure that DOD is able to provide the maximum amount of assistance to these unfortunate people in their time of greatest need.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman [Mr. DANIEL] is offering, in the Chair's estimation, a meritorious amendment.

What the gentleman seeks to do is to amend that portion of the bill to enable the Department of Defense to provide blankets and cots to nine DOD shelters for the homeless without reimbursement. This happens to be the "last train leaving."

My distinguished colleague is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness of the Committee on Armed Services which has as its jurisdiction the operation and maintenance account.

The gentleman is simply offering an amendment to this bill that by virtue of how it is written is appropriate in this bill. We think it is meritorious, and we have no objection whatsoever, and we urge enthusiastic support of the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KRAMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KRAMER: Page 62, line 26, insert after "Basin A," the following: "the South Plants Area,".

Page 64, line 3, strike out ", but" and all that follows through line 5 and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

Mr. KRAMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is technical in nature. It simply is intended to clarify the intent of section 811 of H.R. 1409.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered By Mr. PENNY: At the end of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 819. LIMITATION ON TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED BY TITLES I THROUGH VIII.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall not exceed $8,405,206,000.

Mr. PENNY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. KRAMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I ask

the gentleman what the nature of the amendment is?

Mr. PENNY. If the gentleman will yield, it is a freeze at fiscal year 1985 levels.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment together with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL]. We all know that in this House authorizations fuel appropriations. If we continue to increase authorization levels as we have done in this military construction bill, we are going to lock ourselves into higher appropriation levels than we can afford in future years.

We have huge Federal budget deficits facing this Nation, and many of us in this House felt that one way to stop those deficits from growing is to freeze the budget across the board.

So far this year we have offered freeze amendments to most appropriations and authorization bills that have been brought forward. In almost every instance those amendments have been adopted, and in fact in many instances we have reduced spending in those measures below last year's levels.

In this area, in the area of military construction, we have seen phenomenal growth in the last 5 years. There has been a 250-percent increase in funding in this area of the Federal budget in just that 5-year timeframe. So if there is any one area in the budget where we certainly can live within a freeze level, it ought to be the military construction authorization programs.

In addition, we are now in conference committee with the other body on something called Hollings-Gramm-Rudman. That proposal will require us to make across-the-board reductions in the next several fiscal years in which we exceed certain spending targets. Those spending targets call for us to reduce by $36 billion per year the Federal deficit until we reach a balanced budget.

That is going to call for us to make some tough choices in the Federal budget. I think we can begin by making those tough choices here in the military construction bill today, and I advocate adoption of this freeze.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act is $9,200,000.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend my distinguished colleague for offering his amendment. Certainly in my estimation, the thrust of the amendment is meritorious. We have chosen to offer a substitute amendment rather than challenging my colleague's amendment, simply reiterating why we are offering this amendment. With your indulgence, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to rehash recent history.

The President of the United States submitted to the Congress a military construction authorization bill at the level of $10.3 billion in a military budget in excess of $322 billion.

The House of Representatives, in the first concurrent budget resolution, agreed, in the course of that debate that waged over several days, that the military function would be frozen at fiscal year 1985 levels, which meant a reduction of approximately $3 billion from the President's request of $322 billion down to a figure of $292 billion, which would freeze the military budget at fiscal year 1985 authorization levels. That figure, $292 billion, was a figure given to the House Armed Services Committee as a ceiling against which they could not exceed. The Committee on Armed Services of the House, attempting to allocate its responsibilities within the framework of that charge to freeze at fiscal year 1985 levels the $292 billion, agreed to establish priorities within that. They decided that, based on rather rapid escalation in our procurement and R&D function, that those two functions would take the largest part of the cut. Therefore, the priorities would gravitate toward readiness and quality of life which, over the years, had not been a high priority but, I would submit, a secondary priority, because we have tended in this body to be grossly preoccupied with the technology of death and all the instruments therefor. But we have not focused as diligently as many of us think we should on the human side of this equation.

Therefore, the Committee on Armed Services gave the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, Military Construction, a smaller percentage cut but still within the framework of the $292 billion. We were given the figure of $718 million to cut. The subcommittee went about its business and not only achieved that mark but it exceeded that mark by a few million dollars.

We came in with a budget figure of $759 million below the President's request of $10.3 billion. We therefore reported to the full Committee on Armed Services, with their ratification, to the floor of this body a figure of $9.55 billion fully within the $292 billion freeze figure.

Now a very interesting thing, I would say to my colleague, that my colleague went to the conference with the other body and agreed to a $10 billion increase in the authorization level from $292 to $302 billion.

One would think then that the military construction budget would be increased. But when the smoke settled from the agreements that were arrived at in the large conference, the figure that was given to the military construction function was not $9.55 billion but $9.2 billion. What this amendment does is say, simply, notwithstanding any other action that we have taken on this floor, that this bill would not authorize appropriations in excess of the $9.2 billion, which would leave us at the amount agreed to in the conference, it would take us almost $4 billion below the $9.55 billion which was below the freeze level.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we authorized $9.16 billion last year. So we are only a pittance above the authorization level. I would simply say to my colleague that I understand freeze that appropriation level, but just one final point I would make: Authorization bills, unfortunately, by their nature, are always higher than appropriation bills because you must fund the entire project.

For example, if you fund a project at $30 million, we have to authorize $30 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. The Appropriations Committee can look at that $30 million authorization and say, "Look, you can only spend $6 million in this fiscal year." We therefore appropriate $6 million. You see, but you cannot authorize $6 million, you have to authorize the entire project. It may be funded over several years, and that is one of the reasons why the authorization bills tend to be a little higher.

What I would say to my colleague, as the gentleman knows, I take second to no one in this body to challenging the efficacy of the military budget—I have offered several alternatives myself, and believe that we ought to cut the military budget by substantial billions of dollars—but I would simply say that in this process we worked very diligently to enhance the quality of life. I would say if the gentleman were willing to accept the substitute, this gentleman certainly can promise that we

would not come in here higher than $9.02 billion, and we will try diligently to come in below that figure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute so that I may yield to my distinguished colleague.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I find the approach that the gentleman has suggested a reasonable middle ground because in fact it will leave us in this authorization bill with an authorization level that is about the same as it was for fiscal year 1985.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his cooperation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, by reason of the diligence of our staff, I note a technical error, and I ask unanimous consent to modify my substitute amendment to read "$9,200,000,000."

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS as modified as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act is $9,200,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], as modified, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

The amendment, as modified, offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], as amended.

The amendment as amended, was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we are about to conclude debate on the bill, I want to say to the members of the committee that I want to rise and congratulate my friend, the chairman of the committee, for his perseverance in behalf of junior enlisted people. He has a long-time record in this field. I remember several years back when we were debating a bill that came out of my Personnel Subcommittee at that time involving housing for junior enlisted personnel, the gentleman from California came to me and said, "Coach, I am ready to go in any time you need me."

He went to the well of this House, and we were able to pass that bill with his help.

It came about at a time a lot of people over in the other body were saying that we do not need junior enlisted quarters, "If the Army had intended for you to have a wife, they would have issued you one." I want to tell you how much I appreciate his efforts. The gentleman has always been a strong supporter in behalf of junior people in our military, so-called "grunts," as we call them.

I just felt that I should take the microphone and express to him my appreciation. I am sure other senior members of the committee share that as well.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2860 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2860. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"Funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for a fiscal year for military construction or military family housing purposes may remain available beyond such fiscal year to the extent provided in appropriation Acts."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to funds appropriated after the date of the enactment of Public Law 99-103.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1545

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is essentially a technical amendment which amends existing law under section 2860 of title 10. It is a necessary amendment as a part of an initiative to reform and oversee the actual use of appropriated funds for military construction. The provisions of existing law had their origin in a prior Appropriations Committee bill which became permanent law in the Military Construction Codification Act (Public Law 97-115). The provisions were initially adopted at the request of the Defense Department to give the services flexibility in the use of appropriated funds. However, the services have used this authority to excess in financing prior year projects with current year appropriations and funding current year projects with prior year appropriations. In other words, it has permitted the services to move projects between fiscal years without ever having to report it to the Congress or even to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. This has obviously created confusion and made it virtually impossible for the Defense Department or the Congress to determine the financial status of military construction accounts. For this reason, I am proposing the existing flexibility be rescinded by amending the existing law.

As the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee knows, our Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction had appeared before the Rules Committee seeking a waiver of clause 2 of rule 21 to our bill which contains this same basic provision. Mr. MONTGOMERY of your committee had objected to such a waiver strictly on procedural grounds indicating that it was legislation and should be included in this authorization bill. My understanding is that your committee has no objections to this amendment. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the gentleman's amendment is a contribution to the legislation before us. We have reviewed it. We accept it. We have no objection, and we urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PANETTA: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. OFF-POST RENTAL HOUSING LEASE INDEMNITY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to test the feasibility of implementing a program under which each Secretary of a military department may guarantee compensation of any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or any damage to the rental unit by the member.

(2) The program referred to in paragraph (1) shall be established before the expiration of the 90-day period following the date of the enactment of this Act, but not before October 1, 1985.

(b) ACTIONS BY SECRETARIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—(1) In accordance with

action taken by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a), each Secretary of a military department shall designate one military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of such Secretary to participate in the program established under subsection (a).

(2) For purposes of carrying out this section, any Secretary of a military department, to the extent approved in advance in appropriation Acts, may enter into an agreement with any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces who is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Any agreement under this paragraph shall provide that—

(A) the term of the agreement shall not be for more than one year;

(B) the member shall not pay a security deposit;

(C) the Secretary (except as provided in subparagraphs (D) and (E)) shall compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease by the member and for any damage to the rental unit caused by the member or by any guest or dependent of the member;

(D) the total liability of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) shall not exceed an amount equal to the amount that the Secretary determines would have been required by the lessor as a security deposit absent the agreement authorized in this paragraph;

(E) the Secretary shall not compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) until the lessor exhausts any remedies available to the lessor against the member for the breach or damage; and

(F) the Secretary shall be subrogated to the rights of the lessor in any case in which the Secretary compensates the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C).

(3) Any authority of a Secretary of a military department under this subsection shall be exercised pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) GARNISHMENT OF PAY OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES.—Any Secretary who compensates any lessor under subsection (b) for any damage to a rental unit or any breach of a lease by a member of the armed forces may issue a special order under section 1007 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the withholding from the pay of the member of an amount equal to the amount paid by the Secretary to the lessor as compensation for the breach or damage.

(d) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report concerning the pilot program established under subsection (a), including—

(A) findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the pilot program; and

(B) recommendations as to the feasibility of implementing a program similar to the pilot program on all military installations.

(2) The report referred to in paragraph (1) shall be submitted before the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of any Secretary of a military department to enter into any contract under subsection (b) shall terminate upon the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "armed forces" has the meaning given such term in section 101(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term "military department" has the meaning given such term in section 101(7) of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. PANETTA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the military construction authorization, H.R. 1409, which directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program involving military personnel and their civilian landlords. This amendment would give the Secretary of each branch the authority to designate one military installation in the United States for participation in this program. Under this pilot program, landlords would agree to waive security deposits when renting housing units to military personnel. In return, the Secretary of Defense would agree to guarantee payment on any breach of lease or damage, and to take that money out of the service member's paycheck. This pilot program would run for 1 year, and at the end of that time, we could evaluate its results and consider the possibility of enlarging the program.

All of my colleagues are aware of the tremendous financial and emotional pressures inflicted on our military personnel and their families. This already tense situation is made even worse during a permanent change of station move. Travel and relocation expenses come out of the pockets of our service men and women. Reimbursement comes later, although only $1 out of every $4 spent on a PCS move are reimbursed under the existing system, according to an Air Force study. And when a military family arrives in a new location, it must meet the immediate costs of security deposits, first and last months' rent, utility deposits, and more. Before you can even blink, the military family can be $4,000 in debt. And 2 years later, the military family has to go through the whole process again.

This year, I am proud to say, the Congress has come a long way in dealing with the pressures and inequities inflicted on our men and women in uniform and their families. I am pleased that my own legislation, H.R. 1371, was the first legislative effort in this area. Many of my proposals regarding PCS moves and travel expenses were incorporated in the Department of Defense authorization passed by the House last month.

One of my proposals, however, and one which I feel could lead us even further down the road toward easing the financial burden on our military family, is my proposal to initiate a pilot program involving military personnel and their landlords. Under this program, a landlord would agree not to require a security deposit or last month's rent of a service member. In return, the military post at which the individual is stationed would agree to meet any financial obligations involved in damage or a breach of lease by the service member when that individual is transferred to another post. The amount of the reimbursement could not exceed the amount the Secretary determines would have been required by the lessor as a security deposit if no pilot program were in effect. The Secretary of Defense would then have the authority to garnish the wages of the service member in order to cover any funds paid out to the landlord.

Thus, no appropriation of funds is necessary because the service member would be ultimately responsible for meeting the costs of any damage or breach of lease. Although this pilot program would involve an initial outlay of funds to reimburse landlords, this outlay of funds would be done at the same time money was being withheld from the paycheck of the individual service member. Thus, this program would guarantee that any outlay of funds would be matched with incoming funds, so that no expenditure or appropriation is involved.

I know from my own experience that landlords on the Monterey Peninsula are interested in this program. They understand the hardships imposed on the military family, and they understand that this program guarantees payment for damages and breach of lease, so long as the payment does not exceed the amount of the usual security deposit. They realize, also, that this program would relieve some of the difficulties they experience in renting to military personnel. This program would give landlords one point of contact for all their military tenants and a source of information regarding military personnel who may soon be transferred, thus enabling landlords to prepare for a change in the lease.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the success of this pilot program could lead to a service wide program that would permanently solve one of the major problems facing our military personnel, and do away with certainly one of their largest financial burdens. What is more, no one loses in this program; everybody wins. Landlords are guaranteed their payment, our military personnel are able to use their much-needed money for necessities, and the services are guaranteed reimbursement for any outlays to jilted landlords. It is almost inconceivable that so much good can come from a program that will not cost us anything, and yet imagine the benefits.

When the House voted earlier to accept many of my proposals to ease the burdens on our military personnel, service men and women all over the world breathed a sigh of relief. But we have not yet addressed one of the most pressing, and financially disabling, issues. The test program I propose would address this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support it, so that one day our military men and women will not look on military service as a financially crippling and emotionally draining experience.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that this is a meritorious amendment. This amendment establishes a pilot program to allow the branches of services to establish a program whereby the security deposits can be waived for military personnel. I have toured a number of military bases in this country. You find a young married person with a couple of children. Let us say that they come back from overseas into the United States. They move into the Fort Ord area, which is a resort area, where the cost of living is rather high, and there is a dearth of affordable housing. That young couple has to come up with the first month's rent, the last month's rent, and, in some instances, exorbitant security deposits that force them to have to take advances on their salaries, and they seem to never catch up. Many of them say, "We are lucky if we catch up by the time we are ready to move to our new duty station."

We think that if our young people are going to serve in the military, they should certainly not be adversely affected in that respect. We think that this kind of a demonstration program may lead us to other rules and regulations that would make it much easier for our young married personnel to serve. As my distinguished colleague said, the day is over when we can make the statement that if the military wanted you to have a wife, they would have requisitioned you one. The military is indeed a married military, and we have to face that reality and face up to what our responsibilities are in light of that. The gentleman has offered an important amendment. We agree with it, and we urge its adoption.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARLENEE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARLENEE: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT FORT WILLIAM H. HARRISON, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the State of Montana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 65.4 acres of unimproved land located in the southeast corner of Fort William H. Harrison, Montana, and presently under license to the State of Montana for National Guard use.

(b) CONDITIONS.—(1) The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the real property conveyed be used to establish a Montana State Veterans' Cemetery.

(2) If the property conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purposes described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert at no cost to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

(3) The Secretary shall reserve to the United States a waterline easement for use by the Veterans' Administration Hospital.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and of the easement to be reserved under subsection (b)(3) shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the State.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such other terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. MARLENEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer adding a new section to title VIII of H.R. 1409 would allow for 65.4 acres of Department of Defense land at Fort William H. Harrison in Montana, that is on long-term lease to the Montana National Guard to be used by the State of Montana for a veteran's cemetery. The reason for this transfer is to allow the State of Montana through the Montana National Guard to develop and maintain a cemetery for veterans. The Montana State Legislature has already appropriated funds for the establishment of the cemetery contingent upon our actions here today. In addition, the Montana Veterans' Association plans to donate $10,000 in startup funds. The State will, in their biennial appropriation process, fund the maintenance of the cemetery. This will not cost the Federal taxpayer one red cent.

As background, Montana does not have a national veteran's cemetery. The only cemetery accepting veterans in Montana was the Custer Battlefield National Monument in eastern Montana which has been full since January 1978. It is estimated that nearly 37,000 Montana veterans will pass away between now and the turn of the century. This amendment would provide a burial site for those who served our country.

In summary, my amendment has the support of the Army, the Montana National Guard, the Montana Governor and State Legislature, and the Montana Veterans' Association. Further and of great importance, and I repeat in this day of deficit budgets, is this measure will not cost the U.S. taxpayer any money, plus fully protecting the interests on the United States in seeing that the land is used for the intended purpose.

I urge all Members to support this amendment because it is the right thing to do. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the gentleman has shared his amendment with those of us on the committee. What this entails is a land conveyance from the Army to the State of Montana for a veterans' cemetery. We certainly can find no objection to this utilization of land. Everyone who is a party to the matter is in agreement with it. We appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment. This side of the aisle finds no objection to it and we urge its adoption.

Mr. MARLENEE. I appreciate the cooperation of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member and the good work that they have done in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOWARD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII of the bill (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS AT FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out a project to improve 366 existing military family housing units at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, in the amount of $14,800,000. These housing units include 135 housing units authorized by section 101 of this Act and 231 housing units authorized in section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985.

Mr. HOWARD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the chairman and the ranking minority member and the members of the subcommittee for this fine legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 1409 which would allow Fort Monmouth, a major military installation in my district, to exceed the $30,000 statutory limit per dwelling unit for major improvements to Wherry Housing.

Fort Monmouth needs the limit raised to $38,000 per dwelling unit so that the electrical distribution system can be upgraded to support the installation of kitchen areas, heating and air conditioning systems, hot water heaters, and other items in the Wherry Housing which will enhance the quality of life for Fort Monmouth junior enlisted soldiers and their families. The current electrical distribution system cannot provide the necessary power.

Fort Monmouth does not need a new appropriation to fund this increase. The additional expense will be paid with Army savings. All that is needed is an increased authorization.

Officials at Fort Monmouth have stated that, with this increased authorization, Fort Monmouth will be able to award contracts in fiscal year 1986 that would allow the major interior improvements and the upgrading of the electrical distribution system to be performed concurrently, thereby accelerating completion of the renovation program by 1½ years.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and provide Fort Monmouth with the authorization it needs.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman points out, there is no need for money. This is a language amendment. The amendment is a meritorious amendment. The subcommittee reviewed the amendment subsequent to markup and we have agreed to accept the amendment on this side. We urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VIII?

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

Mr. Chairman, we now come to the end of the debate and end of the markup on this important bill. The Chair tried to carry out his responsibilities that have been bestowed upon me by my colleagues to chair this committee. It is a responsibility that I accept and I appreciate very much. I think all of the Members at some point in our careers serving in this body would hope that we could have the opportunity to serve as subcommittee chairpersons or full committee chairpersons or exercise some leadership in this body. After 15 years, I have been granted that opportunity to do it. This is my third opportunity to come to the floor of this body to bring the military construction authorization bill to the floor. I have tried to carry out that responsibility. I have tried to address my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat, senior Member, junior Member. We have tried to carry out our business without discrimination, without prejudice, without rancor.

As everyone in this body knows, this gentleman has been a critic of our military policy over the years. I want to take a few moments to indicate why at this particular point, now that we have brought the bill to fruition, that this gentleman will rise in opposition to the legislation.

First, let me say why I am not rising in opposition to the legislation. I am not rising in opposition to this bill to cast any doubt or aspersions upon any of my colleagues on the subcommittee. Every single one of my colleagues worked very diligently to bring this bill to the floor. Every single one of my colleagues agreed with me that there was a great need for us to enhance the quality of human life. But where we all agreed to disagree is on the basic implications of our military policy. As the Members know, this gentleman felt strongly enough to bring an alternative military budget to the floor of this House, in the hope that my colleagues would engage in a serious and substantive debate on the principles and values upon which a rational and intelligent military policy ought to be about. We have, for the most part, tended to dance around that, Mr. Chairman, but I hope that, in the future, circumstances will force us to begin to debate more fully and more comprehensively the policies that we ought to be developing that act as the basis for our military budget.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I would like to say that when we chair subcommittees, we not only function institutionally, we not only have that responsibility, but we continue to have our responsibility to represent our respective constituencies. I do not give up my politics in order to chair a subcommittee. I accept it from my colleagues graciously, with a great sense of honor and respect, and with a great deal of appreciation. But all of my colleagues know that I would not abandon the integrity of my political beliefs in order to carry out that responsibility. I am trying to demonstrate that one can indeed be in the progressive wing of the body politic and bring a military bill to the floor of this House. I am also trying to point out that I do not think people ought to be one-man or one-woman or one-person shows, that this is a group-oriented process; so I have not tried to use the prerogatives of the chair to enhance myself on a personal basis, I have not tried to use the subcommittee in any political form whatsoever. I have simply tried to accommodate my colleagues where it was appropriate and where it made sense and where it was effective and where it attempted to take this country in the direction that the majority of my colleagues saw fit.

I can see lightening and hear thunder with the best of them, Mr. Chairman. I understand at this particular moment that my politics stand outside of the consensus that has been established by the majority of my colleagues. But nevertheless I still believe that it is important to those of us who have an alternative perspective to take the opportunity to stand up and articulate that point of view. I hope that I have communicated to my colleagues that I am able to carry out my institutional responsibilities, but I also hope that I am able to say to my colleagues and to everyone else assembled that chairing a committee does not require one to abandon one's politics. This bill came forward 43 to 1. That is not because I voted against family housing. I worked diligently to get family housing in the bill. I am not voting against the bill because we oppose the quality of life issue. I have worked like hell, Mr. Chairman, to try to get us to embrace issues of quality of life. But more I vote against the bill not for the specific work that we did on this tiny little committee trying to carry out its responsibilities with diligence and with a sense of responsibility, but more I cast my vote in opposition because this bill simply reflects back, with the exception of the quality of life issue, the priorities and principles that we have established in the larger bill.

So I would say to those colleagues who voted "no" on the larger bill that this bill simply reflects the same priorities. Those persons who voted for it, I see no reason why they would vote against this bill. In fact, I think that because of some of the attractive aspects of this bill, in my estimation, because it does indeed embrace the quality of life aggressively, that it probably has some more favorable reasons why people would want to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. So, Mr. Chairman, let me just say this in more specific terms and read at least part of the dissenting views that I prepared to accompany the report that accompanies this bill, just to point out and explain why this gentleman voted no:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities that reported this legislation, I know there are some very good projects included in H.R. 1409, as amended. This committee has placed a high priority on the quality of life of our military members, particularly the problems of the military families and their housing needs more specifically. This bill authorizes the construction of 5488 new housing units both in the United States and overseas for a total of over $430 million. While this bill has many benign aspects, such as accompanied and unaccompanied housing, child care centers, physical fitness facilities, family service centers, chapels, and recreational facilities, the majority of the funds are still used to carry out foreign and military policies which I disapprove or with which I disagree.

I support the housing needs of military personnel stationed overseas and believe that once assigned there they must be treated appropriately. However, I still question the policy decision that mandates the level of troop deployment in many of these countries. Overseas deployments continue to support policy decisions with which I disagree and believe should be reexamined.

The military construction budget does not exist in a vacuum, but rather exists in this larger context. It is separated from the larger defense authorization bill merely for legislative convenience. Both of these bills contain money for weapon systems to which I am opposed.

H.R. 1409, as amended, includes funding for the beddown of the following weapon systems which I continue to question:

B-1B manned bomber at $211 million;

C-5B cargo plane at $7 million;

F-15 fighter at $9 million;

Trident submarine and its missile system at $302.8 million;

M-X missile at $42 million;

Ground Launched Cruise Missile (GLCM) at $641.2 million;

Air Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM) at $29 million;

Sgt. York (DIVAD) gun at $8.9 million; and

Space Defense System at $15 million.

This bill also contains around $80 million first year funds to begin construction on two new homeports for the Navy. These two bases are estimated to cost at a minimum $300 million and the Navy is proposing to build five. I believe this decision by the Navy needs to be reexamined and looked at more carefully before we commit to spending millions of dollars on these facilities. Fuller answers must be given to determine the dangers involved with locating weapons so closely to major metropolitan areas, as well as a fuller explanation of the expected costs to the taxpayer and the local communities.

I believe that my analysis of the defense budget must be consistent and that the military construction budget is not a benign part of that process, but reflects the larger policy decisions. I stand in opposition to the military and foreign policy decisions of those who proposed these budgets and continue to oppose the results of the committee action.

There are also parts of the defense authorization bill that I support, yet it continues to impose a set of policies to which I am opposed. It assumes a military solution is possible to settle all conflicts in the world and does not accept the fact that many issues cannot be settled through the use of military force. Most conflicts are mainly political, economic and social in nature and must be met through diplomacy, not force. Therefore I believe that those who view the world in the same way I do would also come to the same conclusion about these bills.

I appreciate the responsibility which my colleagues on the committee have entrusted to me to chair this subcommittee and I hope that I have discharged my responsibilities as well as possible. However, the concerns of the constituency that elected me to Congress are not represented in this military construction budget and therefore I must cast my vote against the bill.

□ 1600

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wish to add, and I recall mentioning this on a previous occasion. I do understand, for one, the policy differences that the gentleman has on this. But looking at it from the institutional point of view, I compliment you and I commend you and your committee, as the gentleman so aptly pointed out, the committee work under your leadership, for the institutional work that you have done, the many, many servicemen and servicewomen who will benefit and have a better life in the service because of the work that the gentleman has done on this bill.

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

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's compliments and I appreciate his respect. It is not an easy thing, the first time this gentleman brought up a bill and said that he would oppose it, that was a joke. I think we have to deal with our dual responsibilities here and try to think them through clearly. Once the process was over, I took my lumps in the committee; I lost my political battles. I won a few and I lost a few.

At the end of that process, I had to step back and say, "If RON DELLUMS was not in the chair, would I support the bill?" If my answer was "no," then getting back in the chair did not change that. I hope that my remarks point out why I am opposing the bill, and I would like to believe that it is on policy and that it is on principle.

I appreciate the respect of my colleagues and I think my colleagues did a fantastic job in bringing what I believe to be a much better bill than might have been brought some years ago.

Mr. SKELTON. The gentleman certainly has our commendation and our respect.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, the question is on the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PANETTA] having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, 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. 1409) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 196, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 38, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

YEAS—354

Akaka	Archer	Bateman
Alexander	Armey	Beilenson
Anderson	Atkins	Bennett
Andrews	Barnard	Bentley
Annunzio	Barnes	Bereuter
Anthony	Bartlett	Berman
Applegate	Barton	Bevill

Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (IN)
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Grotberg
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Olin
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Volkmer
Watkins
Weber
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zschau

NAYS—38

Ackerman
Bates
Burton (CA)
Clay
Crane
Crockett
Dellums
Dymally
Edwards (CA)
Evans (IA)
Frank
Frenzel
Garcia
Gunderson
Hayes
Kastenmeier
Leland
Lundine
Markey
Miller (WA)
Mitchell
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Rangel
Roybal
Savage
Scheuer
Schroeder
Smith, Denny (OR)
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tauke
Towns
Walgren
Weiss
Yates

NOT VOTING—42

Addabbo
Aspin
AuCoin
Badham
Bedell
Bosco
Bustamante
Carr
Chappie
Collins
Conyers
Coughlin
Dixon
Horton
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Lehman (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lujan
McCurdy
McGrath
Mineta
Moody
Nelson
O'Brien
Pashayan
Ritter
Rodino
Rogers
Schneider
Torricelli
Vento
Vucanovich
Walker
Waxman
Weaver
Williams
Wilson
Wright
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

□ 1620

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jones of Tennessee for with Mr. Moody against.

Mr. Torricelli for with Mrs. Collins against.

Mr. Nelson of Florida for with Mr. Dixon against.

Mr. Rodino for with Mr. Williams of Montana against.

Messrs. RANGEL, OWENS, DYMALLY, DENNY SMITH, and LUNDINE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TORRES and Mr. VISCLOSKY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 196, I call up from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1042) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS moves, pursuant to House Resolution 196, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill S. 1042, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 1409, as passed by the House, as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986".

TITLE I—ARMY

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $68,380,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $32,530,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, $55,450,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, $610,000.
Fort Drum, New York, $2,990,000.
Fort Greely, Alaska, $2,500,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, $80,000,000.
Fort Hunter-Liggett, California, $11,100,000.
Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, $5,300,000.
Fort Irwin, California, $30,050,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, $110,880,000.
Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, $940,000.
Fort Meade, Maryland, $18,930,000.
Fort Ord, California, $25,820,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, $27,230,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, $3,600,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, $49,290,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, $1,440,000.
Fort Sheridan, Illinois, $3,500,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, $29,600,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, $14,000,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, $2,650,000.
Yakima Firing Center, Washington, $16,430,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Fort Shafter, Hawaii, $6,300,000.
Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii, $2,150,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, $32,460,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia, $6,450,000.
Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $7,100,000.
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, $5,300,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $39,650,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, $31,760,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, $6,100,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, $46,040,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $20,770,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $6,900,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, $15,471,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, $12,350,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, $39,350,000.
Fort Pickett, Virginia, $420,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, $11,950,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, $52,000,000.
Fort Story, Virginia, $1,950,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, $8,300,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, $4,670,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, $8,960,000.
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, $770,000.

Corpus Christi Army Depot, Texas, $4,400,000.
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, $320,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, $8,650,000.
Fort Wingate, New Mexico, $490,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $19,000,000.
McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma, $2,300,000.
Navajo Depot Activity, Arizona, $240,000.
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $88,000,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, $1,000,000.
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, $19,000,000.
Pueblo Depot Activity, Colorado, $200,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, $820,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $25,750,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, $29,000,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, $6,450,000.
Savanna Army Depot, Illinois, $510,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, $1,410,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, $2,600,000.
Tooele Army Depot, Utah, $11,490,000.
Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon, $260,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, $240,000.

AMMUNITION FACILITIES

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $320,000.
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $210,000.
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa, $810,000.
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas, $570,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $930,000.
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, Louisiana, $640,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $2,910,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $2,050,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, New York, $23,700,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, $7,600,000.
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii, $970,000.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,150,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, $3,200,000.
Oakland Army Base, California, $330,000.
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, North Carolina, $1,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Humphreys Engineer Center, Supt. Activity, Virginia, $11,000,000.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Various, United States, $3,000,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY, JAPAN

Japan, $1,050,000.

EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY

Camp Carroll, Korea, $25,380,000.
Camp Casey, Korea, $12,920,000.
Camp Castle, Korea, $1,100,000.
Camp Colbern, Korea, $550,000.
Camp Edwards, Korea, $1,090,000.
Camp Gary Owen, Korea, $580,000.
Camp Giant, Korea, $1,050,000.
Camp Greaves, Korea, $420,000.
Camp Hovey, Korea, $8,300,000.
Camp Howze, Korea, $1,980,000.
Camp Humphreys, Korea, $9,750,000.
Camp Kittyhawk, Korea, $1,600,000.
Camp Kyle, Korea, $3,580,000.
Camp Liberty Bell, Korea, $800,000.
Camp Market, Korea, $710,000.
Camp Page, Korea, $32,650,000.
Camp Pelham, Korea, $2,400,000.
Camp Red Cloud, Korea, $1,730,000.
Camp Stanley, Korea, $5,500,000.
K-16 Army Airfield, Korea, $2,350,000.
Location 177, Korea, $2,290,000.
Yongin, Korea, $2,550,000.
Yongson, Korea, $9,800,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Kwajalein, $14,600,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND OVERSEAS

Panama, $5,480,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE, AND SEVENTH ARMY

Amberg, Germany, $850,000.
Ansbach, Germany, $14,390,000.
Bad Kreuznach, Germany, $1,100,000.
Bad Toelz, Germany, $1,850,000.
Bamberg, Germany, $6,490,000.
Baumholder, Germany, $900,000.
Darmstadt, Germany, $29,200,000.
Frankfurt, Germany, $18,680,000.
Friedberg, Germany, $9,150,000.
Fulda, Germany, $7,200,000.
Giessen, Germany, $1,700,000.
Goeppingen, Germany, $10,250,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, $2,450,000.
Haingruen, Germany, $680,000.
Hanau, Germany, $48,140,000.
Heidelberg, Germany, $8,800,000.
Heilbronn, Germany, $2,200,000.
Hohenfels, Germany, $6,300,000.
Kaiserslautern, Germany, $3,450,000.
Karlsruhe, Germany, $4,020,000.
Neu Ulm, Germany, $1,000,000.
Nuremberg, Germany, $8,500,000.
Pirmasens, Germany, $14,000,000.
Schoeninger, Germany, $700,000.
Schweinfurt, Germany, $17,840,000.
Stuttgart, Germany, $4,500,000.
Vilseck, Germany, $10,290,000.
Wiesbaden, Germany, $2,900,000.
Wildflecken, Germany, $20,000,000.
Wuerzburg, Germany, $48,070,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $101,000,000.
Various Locations, Greece, $1,440,000.
Various Locations, Italy, $1,850,000.
Various Locations, Turkey, $7,440,000.

SEC. 102. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Fort Ord, California, six hundred units and seventy manufactured home spaces, $50,640,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, fifty manufactured home spaces, $712,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, twenty manufactured home spaces, $253,000.
Bamberg, Germany, one hundred and six units, $7,209,000.
Various locations, ninety-eight units, $6,120,000.
Vilsek, Germany, three hundred and seventy units, $26,830,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, fifty manufactured home spaces, $700,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, fifty manufactured home spaces, $689,000.
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, one unit, $154,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, twenty manufactured home spaces, $317,000.
Fort Drum, New York, eight hundred units, $67,500,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, two units by reconfiguration and fifty manufactured home spaces, $637,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, one hundred and four units and twenty-four manufactured home spaces, $8,674,000.
Fort Myer, Virginia, six units, $596,000.

SEC. 103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $167,521,000, of which $10,950,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, one unit, $99,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, one hundred and sixty-four units, $4,712,000.
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, eighty-one units, $2,762,000.

TITLE II—NAVY

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California, $530,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, $6,905,000.
Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center, Bridgeport, California, $1,470,000.
Marine Corps Camp Detachment, Camp Elmore, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,995,000.
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $24,140,000.
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, $25,175,000.
Marine Corps Air Facility, Camp Pendleton, California, $14,310,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $36,450,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, $30,375,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, $17,420,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, $10,780,000.
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, $3,610,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, $17,970,000.
Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, $22,670,000.
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, $7,060,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $14,700,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $28,900,000.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE NAVY

Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, $2,940,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, $1,880,000.

Naval Space Command, Dahlgren, Virginia, $4,700,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $10,300,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, Lewisville, Arkansas, $675,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, Mayport, Florida, $470,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, $13,000,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, North Island, California, $585,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,880,000.

Intelligence Center, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Commandant Naval District, Washington, District of Columbia, $6,300,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, $3,040,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, $29,835,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $9,960,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, $5,800,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, $16,370,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, $10,820,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, $365,000.

Naval Station, New York, New York, $86,260,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,675,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $800,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, $16,940,000.

Naval Facility, Radio Island, North Carolina, $17,640,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, $2,650,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, $8,650,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington, $5,200,000.

Amphibious Task Force, Camp Pendleton, California, $9,020,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $16,150,000.

Naval Station, Everett, Washington, $17,640,000.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, $36,500,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, $2,300,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, $17,230,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $385,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, $18,593,000.

Commander, Oceanographic System, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,180,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, $16,197,000.

Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, California, $14,120,000.

Naval Station Mare Island, Vallejo, California, $735,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, $2,650,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Fleet and Mine Warfare Training Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,180,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Coronado, California, $9,330,000.

Surface Warfare Officers School Command Detachment, Coronado, California, $5,200,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, $4,360,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, $9,640,000.

Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal School, Eglin, Florida, $13,700,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, $20,740,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,460,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia, $420,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, $11,695,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, $450,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut, $13,300,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $19,580,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, $9,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, $225,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, $5,670,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, California, $4,800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $7,850,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $305,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California, $4,750,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $2,900,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, California, $1,570,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, $810,000.

NAVAL MILITARY PERSONNEL COMMAND

Navy Band, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,900,000.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Medical Clinic, Annapolis, Maryland, $12,540,000.

Naval Hospital, Groton, Connecticut, $8,720,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida, $18,600,000.

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, $6,300,000.

Naval Hospital, Oak Harbor, Washington, $13,900,000.

Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Florida, $7,250,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, $24,980,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, $30,945,000.

Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington, $1,520,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $4,070,000.

Polaris Missile Facility, Atlantic, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,620,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $17,620,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, $9,315,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, $3,720,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,550,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, $1,570,000.

Naval Supply Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $1,555,000.

Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, Washington, $2,440,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia, $388,360,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst, New Jersey, $600,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, $7,160,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, Kentucky, $16,950,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia, $13,080,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $2,350,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island, California, $9,465,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, $7,890,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,860,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $13,700,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida, $8,430,000.

Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, $10,200,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, $23,650,000.

Naval Ship Weapon Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California, $10,780,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, $3,255,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, $6,690,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, San Diego, California, $27,450,000.

Naval Supply Center, San Diego, California, $7,100,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity, Saint Inigoes, Maryland, $15,550,000.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, $5,915,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, $4,220,000.

Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown, Virginia, $4,120,000.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

Naval Oceanography Command Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, $390,000.

Naval Western Oceanography Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $4,500,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Radio Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, $785,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska, $980,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Northwest, Chesapeake, Virginia, $1,385,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California, $395,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, $3,280,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan, $1,775,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa, Japan, $2,990,000.

Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan, $2,250,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada, $700,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, $22,410,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $1,270,000.

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $7,100,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $14,700,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Navy Support Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $16,530,000.

Naval Air Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $22,450,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, $11,270,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, $6,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, $10,200,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, $990,000.

Naval Magazine, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $250,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $13,270,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Naval Activities, London, United Kingdom, $7,635,000.

Naval Support Activity, Naples, Italy, $7,750,000.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy, $5,930,000.

Personnel Support Activity, London, United Kingdom, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, $1,080,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Yokosuka, Japan, $4,400,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communication Area Master Station, Western Pacific, Guam, $8,945,000.

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, $2,690,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Detachment, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $3,700,000.

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Various Locations, $980,000.

SEC. 202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Naval Air Station, Adak, Alaska, one hundred units, $15,500,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, two hundred and eighty-two units, $29,800,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, one hundred units, $8,400,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, two hundred units, $15,200,000.

Fleet Training Group Pacific, Warner Springs, California, forty-four units, $4,400,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, two hundred units, $15,400,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, one unit, $170,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, three hundred units, $24,180,000.

(b) NAVAL PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct the two hundred housing units authorized by subsection (a) for the Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, at Telegraph Point or at any other suitable and appropriate site.

SEC. 203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $34,020,000.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, three hundred seventy-two units, $17,610,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, one unit, $56,500.

SEC. 204. TRANSIENT HOUSING UNITS, CHINHAE, KOREA.

The Secretary of the Navy may convert the four existing transient housing units contained in Building 706 in Chinhae, Korea, to family housing units.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, $28,280,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, $41,699,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, California, $63,129,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, $7,350,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $33,100,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $21,890,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $2,500,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, California, $7,250,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, $14,560,000.

Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, $27,150,000.

Sunnyvale Air Force Station, California, $2,700,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Billy Mitchell Field, Wisconsin, $500,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Buckley Air National Guard Base, Colorado, $12,370,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, $1,730,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, $29,950,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $10,500,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, $22,750,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, $1,900,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, $6,850,000.

Mather Air Force Base, California, $2,700,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $3,200,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Texas, $3,250,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, $16,150,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $4,210,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, $660,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama, $6,000,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $12,000,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Attu Research Site, Alaska, $910,000.

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, $44,950,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, $5,000,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska, $8,600,000.

Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska, $45,900,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $13,160,000.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $10,120,000.

Base 24, Classified Location, $6,170,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, $250,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, $1,620,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, $3,090,000.

Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Florida, $1,700,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $60,330,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Washington, $2,240,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $16,100,000.

Norton Air Force Base, California, $4,570,000.

Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, $440,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $17,150,000.

Travis Air Force Base, California, $10,300,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, $480,000.

Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii, $5,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Cape Cod Air Force Station, Massachusetts, $600,000.

Cavalier Air Force Station, North Dakota, $950,000.

Clear Air Force Station, Alaska $4,500,000.

Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $5,200,000.

SPECIAL PROJECT

Various Locations, $55,000,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, $1,400,000.

Base 34, Classified Location, $8,920,000.

Beale Air Force Base, California, $6,950,000.

Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, $4,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, $4,260,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, $3,150,000.

Castle Air Force Base, California, $3,300,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $16,950,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, $72,064,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, $12,500,000.

F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, $12,550,000.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, $62,730,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, $2,740,000.
Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, $1,700,000.
K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, $22,580,000.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, $1,300,000.
March Air Force Base, California, $9,000,000.
McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, $71,490,000.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, $5,000,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, $4,740,000.
Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, $1,200,000.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, $1,050,000.
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, $1,960,000.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, $4,650,000.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, $5,300,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, $770,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, $8,230,000.
England Air Force Base, Louisiana, $4,900,000.
George Air Force Base, California, $12,640,000.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $16,850,000.
Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, $7,015,000.
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, $8,680,000.
Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, $14,780,000.
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, $8,850,000.
Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, $24,030,000.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $14,600,000.
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $430,000.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, $17,860,000.
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, $2,320,000.
Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, $13,300,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, $8,780,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Air Force Academy, Colorado, $10,310,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Lajes Field, Portugal, $25,285,000.
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $11,600,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Camp Zama, Japan, $1,500,000.
Kadena Air Base, Japan, $27,650,000.
Misawa Air Base, Japan, $9,500,000.
Yokota Air Base, Japan, $13,750,000.
Kimhae Air Base, Korea, $10,400,000.
Kunsan Air Base, Korea, $9,000,000.
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea, $16,310,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, $24,510,000.
Sachon Air Base, Korea, $310,000.
Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean, $5,300,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $15,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Thule Air Base, Greenland, $12,350,000.
Sondrestrom Air Base, Greenland, $5,750,000.
GEODSS Site 5, Portugal, $14,650,000.
Pirinclik Air Station, Turkey, $2,600,000.
BMEWS Site III, Fylingdales, United Kingdom, $3,100,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Panama, $2,172,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Florennes Air Base, Belgium, $5,860,000.
Ahlhorn Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Bitburg Air Base, Germany, $9,050,000.
Einsiedlerhof, Germany, $2,900,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $8,160,000.
Hessisch Oldendorf Air Station, Germany, $1,230,000.
Kapaun Air Station, Germany, $900,000.
Leipheim Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Marienfelde Communications Station, Germany, $2,550,000.
Norvenich Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Pruem Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, $17,470,000.
Sembach Air Base, Germany, $6,460,000.
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, $14,860,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $940,000.
Vogelweh Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Wenigerath Storage Site, Germany, $1,700,000.
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany, $4,550,000.
Aviano Air Base, Italy, $5,070,000.
Comiso Air Station, Italy, $6,280,000.
Decimomannu Air Base, Italy, $2,800,000.
San Vito Air Station, Italy, $1,590,000.
Morocco, $3,100,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $2,710,000.
Keizerveer Air Base, The Netherlands, $270,000.
Vught, The Netherlands, $310,000.
Ankara Air Station, Turkey, $950,000.
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, $11,570,000.
Karatas, Turkey, $2,330,000.
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, $20,910,000.
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, $12,050,000.
RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $1,630,000.
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, $7,400,000.
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $2,840,000.
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, $10,320,000.
RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom, $8,230,000.
RAF Molesworth, United Kingdom, $21,063,000.
RAF Sculthorpe, United Kingdom, $2,350,000.
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $4,640,000.
Various Locations, United Kingdom, $3,600,000.
Base 25, Classified Location, $4,500,000.
Base 29, Classified Location, $3,500,000.
Base 30, Classified Location, $4,830,000.
Base 33, Classified Location, $9,450,000.
Various Locations, Europe, $4,450,000.

SEC. 302. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Florennes, Belgium, four hundred units, $29,200,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, four hundred and forty units, $33,000,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, four hundred units, $30,000,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, family housing support facilities, $1,200,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, one hundred and forty units, $11,000,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, four hundred and fifty units, $37,900,000.
Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, fifty units, $4,000,000.
Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, one hundred and sixty-three units, $14,200,000.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $61,300,000, of which $19,939,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, twenty-four units, $1,200,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, three hundred and twenty-eight units, $12,532,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, thirty-two units, $2,873,000.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, one hundred and ten units, $3,724,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, two hundred and eighty units, $10,279,000.
Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, one hundred units, $6,605,000.
Kadena Air Base, Japan, two hundred and thirty-five units, $12,163,000.
Clark Air Base, Philippines, twenty-nine units, $1,042,000.

(c) IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AT PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO.—(1) To support the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out an improvement project at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, to add to and alter an existing facility and (notwithstanding section 2826 of title 10, United States Code) convert it to a family housing unit with a maximum net floor area of 3,100 square feet at a cost not to exceed $81,000.

(2) The amount of the project authorized by this subsection shall not be considered to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for functions of the Department of the Air Force.

(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term "net floor area" has the same meaning given that term by section 2826(f) of title 10, United States Code.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the follow-

ing installations and locations inside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Anchorage, Alaska, $1,390,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Alameda, California, $1,320,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Barstow, California, $825,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Pedro, California, $700,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Groton, Connecticut, $625,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Port Tampa, Florida, $595,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Fort Riley, Kansas, $965,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Newington, New Hampshire, $1,040,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Verona, New York, $1,395,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $470,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, $8,085,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Texarkana, Texas, $2,635,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, $3,825,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, $750,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, $5,355,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Richmond, Virginia, $650,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Manchester, Washington, $565,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, $1,020,000.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Repromat Secure Storage Facility, Mineral Wells, Texas, $900,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, $7,078,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Classified Location, $12,000,000.

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, $25,000,000.

Classified Location, $3,142,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Kaiserslautern, Germany, $360,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Chimu Wan, Okinawa, Japan, $8,160,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Pyongtaek, Korea, $5,820,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Uijongbu, Korea, $6,200,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Classified Locations, $7,150,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Florennes, Belgium, $7,420,000.

Babenhausen, Germany, $760,000.

Bamberg, Germany, $5,800,000.

Butzbach, Germany, $3,420,000.

Hanau, Germany, $7,480,000.

Heidelberg, Germany, $1,910,000.

Heilbronn, Germany, $2,520,000.

Pirmasens, Germany, $1,630,000.

Schweinfurt, Germany, $3,930,000.

Sembach Air Base, Germany, $2,170,000.

Vilseck, Germany, $6,680,000.

Sigonella, Italy, $5,360,000.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, $4,780,000.

Okinawa, Japan, $300,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, $2,780,000.

Pusan, Korea, $1,540,000.

Taegu, Korea, $730,000.

Soesterberg Air Base, Netherlands, $4,460,000.

Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $7,190,000.

Bicester, United Kingdom, $4,570,000.

Upwood, United Kingdom, $3,240,000.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, $1,060,000.

SEC. 402. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of Defense may construct or acquire twenty family housing units (including acquisition of land) at classified installations in the total amount of $1,800,000.

SEC. 403. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $110,000.

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 605 plus the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RECURRING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,410,786,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101(a), $1,120,111,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 101(b), $450,290,000.

(3) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, $26,000,000.

(4) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $31,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $136,100,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $356,491,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $1,290,794,000, of which not more than $2,520,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $131,047,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE I.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and $73,000,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Eastern Distribution Center, New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania), and $101,000,000 (the amount authorized under section 101(b) for Various Locations, Germany).

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,602,234,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 201(a), $1,521,450,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 201(b), $178,265,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $21,560,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $139,260,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $2,960,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $154,000,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $584,739,000, of which not more than $3,545,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $18,934,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE II.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 201 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 603. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,809,561,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 301(a), $1,224,617,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 301(b), $446,710,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $22,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $144,096,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $30,240,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $226,800,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $715,098,000, of which not more than $2,711,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $45,402,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE III.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 604. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $203,025,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 401(a), $53,132,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 401(b), $93,193,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(4) For construction projects contingency construction authority of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $5,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $27,400,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $1,910,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $18,390,000, of which not more than $14,933,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1986 for military construction functions of the Defense Agencies that remain available for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for military construction projects authorized in section 401 in the amount of $42,025,000.

(c) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE IV.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 401 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and the amount specified in subsection (b).

SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of construction projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure Program, as authorized by section 501, in the amount of $55,000,000.

SEC. 606. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS; EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER TWO YEARS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all authorizations contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor contained in sections 601 through 605) shall expire on October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) do not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later, for construction contracts, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program.

(b) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1984 PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 607(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 780), authorizations for the following projects authorized in sections 101, 201, 301, and 401 of that Act shall remain in effect until October 1, 1986, or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, whichever is later:

(1) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,850,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(2) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,750,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(3) Range modernization in the amount of $2,450,000 at Wildflecken, Germany.

(4) Unaccompanied personnel housing in the amount of $1,400,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(5) Operations building in the amount of $370,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(6) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $480,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(7) Unaccompanied Officer housing in the amount of $600,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(8) Operations building in the amount of $410,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(9) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $620,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(10) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Elefsis, Greece.

(11) Operations control center in the amount of $7,800,000 at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine.

(12) Engine test cell modifications in the amount of $1,180,000 at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida.

(13) Land acquisition in the amount of $830,000 at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California.

(14) Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing in the amount of $10,000,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida.

(15) Electrical distribution lines in the amount of $7,200,000 at the Naval Shipyard Mare Island, Vallejo, California.

(16) Family housing in the amount of $33,982,000 at RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom.

(17) Air freight terminal in the amount of $10,200,000 at Elmendorf, Alaska.

(18) Sewage system in the amount of $2,760,000 at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

(19) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Fort Hunter Liggett, California.

(20) Child care center in the amount of $3,000,000 at Fort Polk, Louisiana.

(21) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $2,200,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California.

(22) Special Process Laboratories Building in the amount of $39,100,000 at Fort Meade, Maryland.

SEC. 607. ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

For projects or contracts initiated during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1, 1985, whichever is later, and ending on the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 or October 1, 1986, whichever is later, the following amounts apply:

(1) The maximum amount for an unspecified minor military construction project under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is $1,000,000.

(2) The amount of a contract for architectural and engineering services or construction design that makes such a contract subject to the reporting requirement under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, is $300,000.

(3) The maximum amount per unit for an improvement project for family housing units under section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is $30,000.

(4) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam under section 2828(b) of title 10, United States Code, is $10,000.

(5)(A) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is $16,800.

(B) The maximum number of family housing units that may be leased at any one time in foreign countries under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is 34,000.

(6) The maximum rental per year for family housing facilities, or for real property related to family housing facilities, leased in a foreign country under section 2828(f) of title 10, United States Code, is $250,000.

SEC. 608. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION FOR GUARD AND RESERVE FACILITIES.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States, $145,924,000, plus $7,565,000 for facilities at Scranton/Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, plus $2,671,000 for facilities at various locations in Alabama, plus $2,186,000 for facilities located in Missouri, plus $755,000 for a facility in New Mexico, and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $66,289,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $61,800,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $139,000,000, and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $70,650,000.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PILOT PROGRAMS.

(a) BUILD-TO-LEASE PROGRAM.—Paragraph (9) of section 2828(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

(b) RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAM.—Subsection (h) of section 802 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 783, 789), is amended by striking out "September 30, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

SEC. 802. FAMILY HOUSING OCCUPANT LIABILITY.

(a) LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO CLEAN SATISFACTORILY.—Subsection (a) of section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) A member of the armed forces—

"(A) who is assigned or provided a family housing unit; and

"(B) who fails to clean satisfactorily that housing unit (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) upon termination of the assignment or provision of that housing unit,

shall be liable to the United States for the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of that failure.".

(b) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.—Section 2775 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by inserting after "the Secretary of Defense" the following: "and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy"; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting after "or defense agency concerned" the following: ", or the operating expenses account of the Coast Guard, as appropriate".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting "(in the case of liability under subsection (a)(1))" after "including".

(2) Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking out "subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(1), or the cost of any cleaning made necessary by a failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit referred to in subsection (a)(2),".

(3) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "or failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit" after "(or the equipment or furnishings of a family housing unit)".

(4) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall include—

"(1) regulations for determining the cost of repairs and replacements made necessary as the result of abuse or negligence for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(1);

"(2) regulations for determining the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of the failure to clean satisfactorily for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(2); and

"(3) provisions for limitations of liability, the compromise or waiver of claims, and the collection of amounts owed under this section.".

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing".

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 165 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing.".

SEC. 803. PREOCCUPANCY TERMINATION COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; and

(2) by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) The Secretary may enter into an agreement under this paragraph in connection with a lease entered into under subsection (c). Any such agreement shall be for any period not in excess of three years and shall be for the purpose of compensating a developer for any costs resulting from the termination of the lease during the construction of the housing units that are to be occupied pursuant to the lease. Any agreement entered into under this paragraph shall include a provision that the obligation of the United States to make payments under the agreement in any fiscal year is subject to the availability of appropriations.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 804. ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF FAMILY HOUSING.—Section 2821 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Amounts authorized by law for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities include amounts for—

"(1) minor construction;

"(2) improvements to existing military family housing units and facilities;

"(3) relocation of military family housing units under section 2827 of this title; and

"(4) architectural and engineering services and construction design.".

(b) FAMILY HOUSING SUPPORT.—(1) Chapter 169 of such title is amended by adding after section 2832 the following new section:

"§ 2833. Family housing support

"Amounts authorized by law for support of military family housing include amounts for—

"(1) operating expenses;

"(2) leasing expenses;

"(3) maintenance of real property expenses;

"(4) payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred; and

"(5) payments of mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m).".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2832 the following new item:

"2833. Family housing support.".

SEC. 805. DOMESTIC FAMILY HOUSING LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "(3) Not" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not"; and

(2) by adding the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(B) During fiscal years 1986 and 1987, the number of housing units that may be leased pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (A) may be increased by 500 units for each such fiscal year. The Secretary concerned shall provide written notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the location, purpose, and cost of the additional units permitted by this subparagraph. Such notification shall be made periodically as the leases are entered into.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 806. SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.—Effective as of September 30, 1985, section 807(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law No. 98.115; 97 Stat. 786), is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1986".

(b) APPROVAL OF TRANSACTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out the following sale-and-replacement transactions under the provisions of section 2667a of title 10, United States Code:

(1) The sale and replacement of warehousing facilities at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

(2) The sale and replacement of a noncommissioned officers professional education center, a band center, and a combat operations center at March Air Force Base, California.

SEC. 807. TURN-KEY SELECTION PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter III the following new section:

"§2862. Turn-key selection procedures

"(a)(1) The Secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, may use one-step turn-key selection procedures for the purpose of entering into contracts for the construction of authorized military construction projects.

"(2) In this section, 'one-step turn-key selection procedures' means procedures used for the selection of a contractor on the basis of price and other evaluation criteria to perform, in accordance with the provisions of a

firm fixed-price contract, both the design and construction of a facility using performance specifications supplied by the Secretary concerned.

"(b) The Secretary of a military department may not, during any fiscal year, enter into more than three contracts for military construction projects using procedures authorized by this section.

"(c) The authority of a Secretary of a military department under this section shall expire on October 1, 1991.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2861 the following:

"2862. Turn-key selection procedures.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 808. COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of Defense may use funds appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for planning and design purposes to provide community planning assistance when local resources are not sufficient, by grant or otherwise, as follows:

(1) To assist communities located near newly established Light Infantry Division Posts, $2,000,000.

(2) To assist communities located near newly established homeports under the Naval Strategic Dispersal Program, $3,000,000.

SEC. 809. MADIGAN ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, FORT LEWIS WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1512), is amended by striking out "and the amount specified in subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the amount specified in subsection (b)(1), and $326,800,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, Washington)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 810. INTERSERVICE EXCHANGES.

Section 2571 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No agency or official of the executive branch of the Federal Government may establish any regulation, program, or policy or take any other action which precludes, directly or indirectly, the Secretaries concerned from carrying out this section.".

SEC. 811. PLAN FOR CLEANUP OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall develop and transmit, by December 31, 1985, to the Congress a report setting forth a comprehensive plan for completing the cleanup of contaminated sites, structures, equipment, and natural resources at or near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, Colorado, by September 30, 1993.

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—In such plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) describe in detail the various phases for the project, along with the completion dates and a priority ranking of the goals for each such phase;

(2) provide cost estimates for each such phase and for the total project;

(3) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of consultation, before the transmittal of the plan, with State and local officials (including officials of water districts) and the general public;

(4) provide that consultation and coordination with such officials and the general public will be carried out throughout the process of cleaning up the Arsenal;

(5) provide for priority cleanup of—

(A) the most seriously contaminated areas at the Arsenal, including the areas known as Basin F, Basin A, the South Plants Area, and section 36;

(B) other areas at the Arsenal which should be afforded priority treatment for the benefit of the general public, including the areas known as sections 7, 8, 11, and 12; and

(C) any sites, structures, equipment, or natural resources located outside the Arsenal that have been contaminated by activities carried out at the Arsenal;

(6) provide for the cleanup of the areas described in paragraph (5) without regard to whether a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal has been selected;

(7) establish, as a priority, the use of waste-treatment technologies that will reduce significantly the amount and toxicity level of hazardous substances at or near the Arsenal;

(8) provide for selection of a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal in a manner that will take into consideration sites, within and outside of Colorado, that—

(A) are geologically suitable to serve as such a disposal site; and

(B) are located within areas the governing bodies of which have expressed a willingness to have such a disposal site located therein;

(9) provide that all activities in the plan will be carried out in compliance with the requirements of applicable Federal and State environmental laws;

(10) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of studying the feasibility and cost of cleansing groundwater on an expedited basis at the sources of contamination on the Arsenal; and

(11) include a statement concerning any reprogramming or supplemental appropriation of funds that may be necessary for fiscal year 1986 in order to assure an expeditious implementation of the plan.

SEC. 812. PROJECT AMOUNT FOR FORT DRUM, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount established for a project at Fort Drum, New York, by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1495) is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(b) FUNDING.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1986 for military construction functions of the Army that remain available for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, for the military construction project described in subsection (a), in the amount of $82,500,000.

(c) COST OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the limit established by section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, on the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 of that Act is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 813. MATERIAL AT NAVAL BASE, NORFOLK, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary of the Navy may provide, without compensation, to the City of Norfolk, Virginia, not more than 50,000 cubic yards of dredged material located at the Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia, if such city agrees to bear all costs and liabilities associated with loading, transporting, using, or otherwise handling such material.

SEC. 814. LAND CONVEYANCE TO THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE; COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Air Force (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the United States Olympic Committee, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 3.98 acres of land and improvements near Colorado Springs, Colorado, that are being leased to such Committee by the Secretary pursuant to section 806 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1980.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance described in subsection (a) shall be subject—

(1) to the condition that the land and improvements so conveyed shall be used by the United States Olympic Committee solely for facilities and activities of such Committee;

(2) to the condition that if such land and improvements are not used for the purpose described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to them shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon; and

(3) to such other conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact description of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 815. ALTERATION IN TRAILER PARK EXPANSION, HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In providing for the trailer park at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, and the expansion of such park as authorized by section 302 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, the Secretary of the Air Force may enter into an agreement with the Massachusetts Port Authority to terminate leasehold rights of the Department of the Air Force in exchange for—

(1) leasehold rights to other land held by such Authority; and

(2) the construction, by such Authority or its designee, of roads, utilities, and trailer pads on such other land in accordance with specifications made by the Secretary.

(b) LIMITATION.—The termination of the leasehold rights by the Secretary shall not become effective until the completion of the construction described in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 816. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) TRANSFERS UNDER EXCESS PROPERTY PROVISIONS AUTHORIZED.—In accordance with the provisions of section 202 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483) governing transfers of excess property—

(1) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (b) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of the Army; and

(2) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (c) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of State.

(b) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT FORT MCNAIR.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the property described in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 10.5 acres, to-

gether with improvements thereon, adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia.

(c) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT ARLINGTON HALL STATION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the property described in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 72 acres, together with improvements thereon, known as Arlington Hall Station in Arlington County, Virginia.

SEC. 817. LAND EXCHANGE, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) through (f), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the NEW MET Company (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Company") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 39.5 acres of unimproved land comprising a portion of the Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, located adjacent to the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance by the Secretary under subsection (a), the Company shall convey to the United States a parcel of land consisting of approximately 31.7 acres located in the vicinity of the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Company are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties dated February 19, 1985.

(d) PAYMENT BY THE COMPANY.—If the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Company shall pay the difference to the United States.

(e) SURVEY.—The exact acreages and legal descriptions of the lands to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys which are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Company.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the transaction authorized by this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 818. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Subject to subsections (b) through (g), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the Westvaco Corporation (the principal address and place of business of which is 299 Park Avenue, New York, New York, and hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Corporation") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 47.83 acres of improved land comprising that portion of the Navy Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, located at Remount Road and Virginia Avenue, in the city of North Charleston.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance authorized by subsection (a), the Corporation shall pay all costs for construction and occupancy by the Navy of "in kind" facilities to replace those on the land to be conveyed. The replacement facilities shall be constructed by the Navy on the Naval Weapons Station described in subsection (a) at a site to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Corporation are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties that became effective April 17, 1985. The Secretary is authorized to receive, obligate, and disburse funds received under subsection (b) to cover design, construction, relocation, and related costs specified in the memorandum of understanding.

(d) VACATING PROPERTY.—Upon completion and occupancy of the replacement facilities by the Navy and payment of all costs by the Corporation, the Navy shall promptly vacate the property described in subsection (a) and convey it by quitclaim deed to the Corporation.

(e) PAYMENT OF ANY EXCESS.—If the fair market value of the improved land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the consideration paid under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Corporation shall pay the difference to the United States.

(f) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of any land conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey which is satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such survey shall be borne by the Corporation.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

SEC. 819. TERMINATION DATE FOR CERTAIN AUTHORITY.

Section 808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1983, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) The authority of the Secretary to carry out this section shall terminate on October 1, 1990.".

SEC. 820. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

(a) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Navy shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs approximately 15.31 acres of real property, including improvements thereon, at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida.

(b) USE OF LAND.—The real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) shall become part of the Barrancas National Cemetery and shall be administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) CONDITION.—If the real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purpose described in subsection (b), the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall transfer such property, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and location of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined in a survey approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 821. AVIGATION RIGHTS ON SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLORIDA.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all right, title, and interest in the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1229), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. The prohibition contained in subdivision d. of the first section against the erection of any structure or obstacle on the land conveyed under this Act in excess of seventy-five feet above mean low-water level shall be deemed to be a prohibition against the erection of a structure or obstacle in excess of two hundred feet above mean low-water level in the case of that portion of such land on Santa Rosa Island which is east of the Destin East Pass and known as Holiday Isle.".

SEC. 822. LAND CONVEYANCE, DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, TUCSON, ARIZONA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the highest and best use of the lands described or identified in subsection (b) is public park and recreational use or public health use;

(2) the city of Tucson, Arizona, has indicated a willingness to extend the existing lease to the United States Air Force of the lands described in subsection (c) for an additional fifty years commencing in 2002 at the existing rental rate of $773 per year;

(3) therefore, the Administrator of General Services should—

(A) assign to the Secretary of the Interior lands described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park or recreational area; and

(B) assign to the Secretary of Health and Human Services lands identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2) for public health use;

(4) the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be, should, simultaneously with the acceptance of the extension of the lease for the lands described in subsection (c), convey to the city of Tucson, Arizona—

(A) the property described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park recreational area through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2)), and

(B) such land as is identified in subsection (b)(2) for public health use through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(1)(B) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(1)(B)).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND SUITABLE FOR PARK OR RECREATIONAL USE AND FOR PUBLIC HEALTH USE.—(1) The property described in this paragraph is 61 acres of real property adjacent to Golf Links/Craycroft Intersection, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona.

(2) The property identified in this paragraph is such portion (not exceeding eight acres) of the land described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with the concurrence of the Secretaries of the Interior and Defense, determines to be suitable for conveyance for public health use.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SUBJECT TO LEASE.—The property described in this subsection is 4,348.81 acres of real property owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.

(d) SURVEYS OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the city of Tucson, Arizona.

SEC. 823. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL GUARD ARMORIES.

(a) CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES.—Subsection (e) of section 2233 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure, or contribute to any State such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary to procure, architectural and engineering serv-

ices and construction designs in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.".

(b) AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Subsection (b) of section 2236 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(b) A contribution made for an armory under section 2233(a) (4) or (5) of this title may not exceed the sum of—

"(1) 100 percent of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services (including advance architectural, engineering and design services under section 2233(e) of this title); and

"(2) a percentage of the cost of construction (exclusive of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services) calculated so that upon completion of construction the total contribution (including the contribution for architectural, engineering and design services) equals 75 percent of the total cost of construction (including the cost of architectural, engineering and design services).

For the purpose of computing the cost of construction under this subsection, the amount contributed by the State or Territory, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned, may not include the cost or market value of any real property that it has contributed.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 824. FURNISHING OF BEDDING FOR HOMELESS.

Section 2546 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

"(d) The Secretary concerned may provide bedding for support of shelters for the homeless that are operated by entities other than the Department of Defense. Bedding may be provided under this subsection without reimbursement, but may only be provided to the extent that the Secretary determines that the provision of such bedding will not interfere with military requirements.".

SEC. 825. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act is $9,200,000,000.

SEC. 826. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2860 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2860. Availability of appropriations

"Funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for a fiscal year for military construction or military family housing purposes may remain available beyond such fiscal year to the extent provided in appropriation Acts.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to funds appropriated after the date of the enactment of Public Law 99-103.

SEC. 827. OFF-POST RENTAL HOUSING LEASE INDEMNITY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to test the feasibility of implementing a program under which each Secretary of a military department may guarantee compensation of any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or any damage to the rental unit by the member.

(2) The program referred to in paragraph (1) shall be established before the expiration of the 90-day period following the date of the enactment of this Act, but not before October 1, 1985.

(b) ACTIONS BY SECRETARIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—(1) In accordance with action taken by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a), each Secretary of a military department shall designate one military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of such Secretary to participate in the program established under subsection (a).

(2) For purposes of carrying out this section, any Secretary of a military department, to the extent approved in advance in appropriation Acts, may enter into an agreement with any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces who is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Any agreement under this paragraph shall provide that—

(A) the term of the agreement shall not be for more than one year;

(B) the member shall not pay a security deposit;

(C) the Secretary (except as provided in subparagraphs (D) and (E)) shall compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease by the member and for any damage to the rental unit caused by the member or by any guest or dependent of the member;

(D) the total liability of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) shall not exceed an amount equal to the amount that the Secretary determines would have been required by the lessor as a security deposit absent the agreement authorized in this paragraph;

(E) the Secretary shall not compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) until the lessor exhausts any remedies available to the lessor against the member for the breach or damage; and

(F) the Secretary shall be subrogated to the rights of the lessor in any case in which the Secretary compensates the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C).

(3) Any authority of a Secretary of a military department under this subsection shall be exercised pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) GARNISHMENT OF PAY OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES.—Any Secretary who compensates any lessor under subsection (b) for any damage to a rental unit or any breach of a lease by a member of the armed forces may issue a special order under section 1007 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the withholding from the pay of the member of an amount equal to the amount paid by the Secretary to the lessor as compensation for the breach or damage.

(d) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report concerning the pilot program establishing under subsection (a), including—

(A) findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the pilot program; and

(B) recommendations as to the feasibility of implementing a program similar to the pilot program on all military installations.

(2) The report referred to in paragraph (1) shall be submitted before the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of any Secretary of a military department to enter into any contract under subsection (b) shall terminate upon the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "armed forces" has the meaning given such term in section 101(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term "military department" has the meaning given such term in section 101(7) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 828. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT FORT WILLIAM H. HARRISON, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the State of Montana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 65.4 acres of unimproved land located in the southeast corner of Fort William H. Harrison, Montana, and presently under license to the State of Montana for National Guard use.

(b) CONDITIONS.—(1) The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the real property conveyed be used to establish a Montana State Veterans' Cemetery.

(2) If the property conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purposes described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert at no cost to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

(3) The Secretary shall reserve to the United States a waterline easement for use by the Veterans' Administration Hospital.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and of the easement to be reserved under subsection (b)(3) shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the State.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such other terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 829. FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS AT FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out a project to improve 366 existing military family housing units at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, in the amount of $14,800,000. These housing units include 135 housing units authorized by section 101 of this Act and 231 housing units authorized in section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985.

The motion was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1409) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1042

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 196, I move that the House insist

on its amendment to the Senate bill, S. 1042, to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPIN, DELLUMS, MONTGOMERY, HUTTO, LEATH of Texas, DICKINSON, WHITEHURST, and KRAMER.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 1042, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the House amendment to the Senate bill, S. 1042, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes, including section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the Senate bill, S. 1042.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION REQUIRING DEATH PENALTY FOR HIJACK MURDERERS

(Mr. MOORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate hijacking recently which resulted in the death of Leon Klinghoffer gave us an example of a loophole that exists in our current law. Only last year this Congress passed a law making it a crime for a terrorist to strike against the United States or Americans anywhere in the world, to make that a Federal crime. That is the first time that ever happened; however, the harshest sentence we can mete out to such a terrorist is life imprisonment. I think the murder of Leon Klinghoffer has pointed out that that is not strong enough or good enough. We currently have a death penalty for someone who commits a killing during an aircraft hijacking, but that is not the case in these other forms of terrorism. There should be no difference.

Therefore, a terrorist who kills an American in a case like this in terrorism should be given the same kind of sentence as one who does it in an aircraft hijacking.

We need to close this loophole in the law. Today I have introduced legislation that will authorize capital offense, or the death penalty, for anyone who commits murder during an act of terrorism against U.S. citizens anywhere in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to correct this loophole in the law and to mete out a proper sentence for people like these terrorists who struck against Mr. Klinghoffer recently.

EXTENDED VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 long years since the civil war in El Salvador erupted. The war has claimed thousands of innocent lives and has devastated this tiny country—which is about the size of my home State of Massachusetts.

Today, the violence, the indiscriminate killings, and the terror continue.

President Duarte, convinced that the current climate in El Salvador is unsafe, recently sent his family members to the United States to wait out the storm. In a sense, President Duarte is affording his family members a sort of extended voluntary departure status.

Mr. Speaker, the understandable anguish and fear that President Duarte has over the safety of his family should also be extended to the thousands of refugees who have fled El Salvador in search of a temporary safe haven.

For this reason, I have sent President Reagan a letter today urging that he reconsider his stand against granting Salvadoran refugees extended voluntary departure. The general conditions of violence and civil unrest in El Salvador are a clear justification for Salvadorans to be afforded this temporary status.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues in the House to support my legislation, H.R. 822, which would grant Salvadorans now in the United States a temporary stay of deportation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to the RECORD a copy of my letter to President Reagan as well as two excellent articles describing the current situation in El Salvador:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 15, 1985.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I share your concerns over the future of El Salvador and pray that a peaceful resolution to the current conflict can soon be reached.

However, the violence and civil unrest which has plagued El Salvador since 1979 continues to be a fact of life in that tiny country. In fact, as the Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Salvador, Arturo Rivera y Damas, has said, "Many are feeling the sensation that they are returning to the worst years of social intranquillity."

Two recent reports published by the Americas Watch Committee and Amnesty International document a recent resurgence of death squad activity in El Salvador, numerous civilian casualties as a result of the indiscriminate nature of aerial bombardments and an increase in civilian deaths due to the harsh tactics of the Salvadoran guerrillas. In short, El Salvador is a country still very much in turmoil.

The recent decision by President Jose Napoleon Duarte to send his family members to the United States to wait out the storm, dramatizes the fear that so many Salvadoran refugees who have fled their country must feel. We can all understand President Duarte's anguish in sending his family to the United States for temporary safety. However, I believe we should also recognize that the Salvadoran refugees who are now in the United States have the same concerns.

Therefore, I respectfully urge you to reconsider your stated position against granting Salvadoran refugees extended voluntary departure. Granting Salvadorans temporary safety from the current violence in their homeland would be a great humanitarian gesture, and could very well result in the saving of many innocent lives.

Sincerely,

JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1985]

A YEAR AFTER TALKS, SALVADOR PEACE RECEDES

(By James LeMoyne)

SAN SALVADOR, October 13.—A year ago, Salvadoran leftist guerrillas and President Jose Napoleon Duarte met for the first time in the mountain village of La Palma and raised the hopes of their countrymen that peace might come after five years of civil war.

Those hopes may have been impossibly high, but their loss today is palpable and has even reached into Mr. Durate's home. The President, who walked unarmed into the heart of a war zone to meet the guerrillas, is now imploring them to release his kidnapped daughter.

Conversations with dozens of Salvadorans from all classes of society give the strong impression that exhaustion is gaining hold in a country that has joined Northern Ireland and Lebanon as a land in which violence is normal. Resignation, cynicism and a simple hunger to survive have replaced the fragile faith that many placed in Mr. Duarte and the rebels' promise to try to stop fighting 12 months ago.

In a grim sermon last Sunday, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Salvador, Arturo Rivera y Damas, said, "Many are feeling the sensation that they are return-

ing to the worst years of social intranquillity."

"What one sees most of all," said an elderly Catholic priest who often works with refugees here, "is the suffering of the common people. They don't see an exit. There isn't an exit."

In two meetings last October and November, the Government and rebels failed to narrow the differences between their separate visions of El Salvador's future.

The Government insists the rebels give up their guns and stand in elections. The rebels insist on being given a share of power first. Each side accuses the other of demanding total surrender and each has returned to the battlefields with a vengeance.

Someone is killed for political reasons virtually every day somewhere in this small, overcrowded country. Rebel sabotage frequently knocks out electricity and there is seldom an evening when gunfire or an exploding bomb does not echo in some part of the capital.

At least 4,000 soldiers, guerrillas and civilians are estimated to have been killed or wounded in the year since La Palma. At least 40 soldiers and 10 guerrillas died in a single rebel attack four days ago. It is difficult to meet a Salvadoran who has not lost a friend or relative in the years of fighting.

A new development in a war that has been noted for its inhumanity has been a sharp increase in human rights abuses by the rebels of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front. In a newly declared "war of attrition" the guerrillas have carried out indiscriminate mining of roads, two attacks in which 27 unarmed people were killed, the kidnapping of 23 mayors, and several shootings of civilians who refused to accept the rebels' demand that all highway traffic cease.

In the last week the guerrillas machine-gunned a pickup truck, killing four civilians. A young boy died when he stepped on a rebel mine.

300,000 ARE REFUGEES

Right-wing death squad killings have fallen dramatically, but they are more frequent than the Government cares to admit. A teen-ager was found beheaded last week, a university lecturer was shot dead and three other men were found tied and shot through the head.

Government security forces have largely stopped killing prisoners, but the police arrest hundreds of suspects each month and detainees frequently say they are beaten or threatened with death. More than 300,000 Salvadorans are refugees from the war. Army troops have forced hundreds of rebel supporters to leave their homes, burning their fields and ordering them to enter refugee camps.

There are other markers to measure the emotional and political distance the country has slid from the giddy heights of last year's talks. According to one of Mr. Duarte's closest aides, Julio Adolfo Rey Prendes, the rebels' decision to kidnap Mr. Duarte's daughter a month ago has "changed the rules of the game" by making targets of family members of political leaders. He said the action has set back the possibility of peace. "We have regressed rather than advanced in the question of humanizing the conflict," Mr. Rey Prendes said.

Nidia Diaz, one of the rebel commanders who sat down with Mr. Duarte at the La Palma bargaining table, is recovering in a police cell, shot five times by an army helicopter gunship that ambushed a guerrilla patrol. Her diary recording each side's statements at La Palma was shot through by machine-gun bullets.

DEADLOCK SEEN DEVELOPING

Though they will not say it on the record, American diplomats privately concede that a deadlock is developing. The Government, they say, can contain the rebels but not defeat them. And though the guerrillas have never had, and probably will never gain, the support of the majority of the population, they appear capable of carrying out sabotage, assassinations, kidnappings and ambushings indefinitely.

"Things have gotten worse because they have not gotten better," a foreign diplomat here said, noting a hardening in the guerrillas' position. "I was very optimistic a year ago. I'm not now."

The handful of Social Democrats who make up the democratic wing of the largely Marxist rebel movement have never looked weaker or appeared to have a smaller say in guerrilla actions than today. Guillermo Ungo, head of the small band of political representatives in the Democratic Revolutionary Front, who attended La Palma and called it the "first step of a positive dialogue," now warns of more war to come. "The Reagan administration no longer talks of a quick victory in El Salvador," he said in a recent interview.

Mr. Duarte has also moved closer to Government army commanders. He frequently lauds the army's performance in the field, and has made a special point of wooing army support as he moves into his second year of war as leader of the country.

The senior guerrilla military commander, Joaquin Villalobos, emphasized the guerrillas' new determination when he invited reporters to his mountain headquarters four months ago. The rebels, he said, will never lay down their arms until the United States withdraws its assistance from El Salvador.

DUARTE "THE MAIN ENEMY"

The guerrillas' verbal attacks on Mr. Duarte and his Christian Democratic Party reflect the tougher line.

"Napoleon Duarte is not a simple executioner like Roberto d'Aubuisson," the rebel radio, Venceremos, said last week. "He is the main enemy, the Christian Democratic Party is the main enemy, the criminal of today only with a new style." Mr. d'Aubuisson is a right-wing political leader who has frequently been accused of leading death squads.

Guerrilla commanders say their strategy is to wear the Government down and force it to make concessions.

The continuing war reflects the militarism and sectarianism that have characterized Salvadoran politics and society for a century.

But as the country's head of state, Mr. Duarte is stuck with the burden of office and he risks being blamed for a conflict that continues to defy political solutions. This week El Salvador will begin its seventh year at war.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1985]

DUARTE SENDS THREATENED FAMILY MEMBERS TO U.S.

(By Edward Cody)

SAN SALVADOR, October 14.—President Jose Napoleon Duarte, reacting to threats of more kidnapings against his family, sent three daughters and their children to the United States today aboard a U.S. Air Force jet.

The Salvadoran leader, whose daughter Ines was abducted by gunmen Sept. 10, said an unknown caller has telephoned several times since then claiming to have plans to kidnap more members of his family. As a result, they have been living "penned up" for security, he added. One bodyguard was killed and an other wounded in the kidnaping of Ines.

"Even this morning there was a car following up on my daughter, and we had to take special precautions," Duarte said after seeing his children depart on the white-and gray DC9 from the capital's Ilopongo military airport.

The president's decision to send threatened relatives to the United States was interpreted as a measure of concern here over the possibility of more attacks on Salvadoran or U.S. officials and their families by urban commandos working with the leftist rebels' Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front.

Although only a precaution, it amounted to indirect recognition that the threat is considered serious enough that already tight security measures surrounding Duarte and his family are seen as insufficient.

The rebel front, known by its Spanish initials as the FMLN, has not officially acknowledged kidnaping Duarte's daughter and has made no public threats against his other children. But Information and Culture Minister Julio Rey Prendes has said repeatedly that the rebels are holding the daughter and that the government is dealing with FMLN officials in two-way radio contacts designed to gain her freedom in exchange for captured rebel leaders.

U.S. soldiers also have been threatened with capture or assassination by the rebels' official Radio Venceremos, leading to what one diplomat described as sharply increased worry among U.S. personnel stationed here.

Four U.S. marines who were embassy guards and two other Americans were killed at a sidewalk cafe June 19 in assassinations later acknowledged by the FMLN. More recently, the front said in a communique that the main objective of its attack last Thursday on the Salvadoran Army's main training base was killing or capturing U.S. military advisers stationed there.

U.S. Ambassador Edwin Corr, who accompanied Duarte at the airport, said no American diplomats, military advisers or their families have left the country.

Duarte has four daughters, the kidnaped Ines Guadalupe Duarte de Duran, 35, and the three who left today with their children. He also has two sons. One of them, Alejandro, also accompanied the president as he saw off his daughters and grandchildren. "The men of the family and my wife are remaining here," he said.

[El Salvador's ambassador in Washington, Pablo Alberge, said he was expecting Duarte's daughters, Maria Elena and Lorena, and Lorena's husband and child in Washington. He said the four would stay with him indefinitely at the embassy residence. One of Duarte's sons, Napoleon, a World Bank employe, already lives in Virginia.

[Alberge also said Alejandro Duarte's wife and three children were flown to Miami and would remain there, while the other daughter of Duarte, Maria Eugenia, was flown to Atlanta with her husband and one child.]

Corr said the plane was a scheduled government flight from U.S. Southern Command headquarters in Panama bound for Washington with possible stops on the way.

Duarte emphasized that he continues to act as president and that the government continues to function. This was seen as a re-

sponse to reports that some military officers have expressed fears that the government, by negotiating with the kidnapers and seeming willing to bow to their demands for releasing prisoners, would appear weak and give the rebels the status of a legitimate belligerent in the war.

The president's decision came one year after his first meeting with rebel officials at the mountain town of La Palma for what was intended to be the beginning of a dialogue aimed at ending El Salvador's five-year-old civil war.

"The guerrillas have forgotten the spirit of La Palma," he declared.

GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONY FOR THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the company of distinguished colleagues from the House, Senate, the President's Cabinet, and ambassadors of many countries, I had the moving privilege of participating in the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Holocaust Memorial Museum.

It is my intention, when the proceedings of this whole event are available, to place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in their entirety.

This morning I wish to share with my colleagues the words of the witness, victim, chronicler, and conscience of the Holocaust—Elie Wiesel—who lifted the occasion to its appropriate historical height:

In this place, dedicated to the noble and urgent cause of remembrance, we pledge to tell as much as possible, as truthfully as possible, what Nazi Germany and its accomplices did to six million Jews and to the other millions of victims of Nazi atrocities.

We realize that the full story of that crime, and the resistance to that crime, can never be told. Yet we know that we must try.

We shall tell the tale, not to divide people, but on the contrary to bring them closer together. We shall evoke past suffering, not to inflict more suffering, but, on the contrary, to diminish it. We shall remind of what took place in Auschwitz and Treblinka, sites of ultimate degradation and humiliation, not to humiliate anyone, but, on the contrary, to teach future generations, and our own, to humiliate no one.

In this place we shall try to bear witness for the dead and the living.

The text of Elie Wiesel's moving speech follows:

ADDRESS BY ELIE WIESEL

Secretary Hodel, Ambassador Rosenne, Distinguished Members of the Senate and House, your Excellencies, Mark Talisman, Linda Chavez, and friends.

Today, as we begin to lend a physical dimension to our relentless quest to remembrance, it is fitting to express our profound gratitude to Congress and to the people of the United States for the help and encouragement they have offered us in carrying out our historical mandate.

Outside of Israel, ours is the only nation in the world that has made a commitment to establish such a national museum.

The help we have received has always been bipartisan in both Houses of Congress now and since years ago when, at the initiative of Jimmy Carter, we began this historic project. The administration—irrespective of its political party—has never refused to assist us in our various efforts. The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of State and their respective staffs have given us their indispensable support. The general public has responded to our appeals with the characteristic generosity of the American people. As for the President of the United States, not only has he often participated in our Remembrance Ceremonies, but he has also graciously accepted to serve as Honorary Chairman of our Campaign to Remember. On behalf of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, its advisers and staff, I thank them, and I thank you—from the depths of my heart.

Now it is up to us to continue. If we fulfill our mission, future generations will benefit from it. But the task is neither simple nor easy. The story we must tell cannot be told—not in its entirety. In our case, the sum of the fragments does not convey the full message. Words, images, memories, prayers, fears, agonies: How does one communicate the burning of a ghetto? Or the arrival of a convoy at Birkenau at midnight? Or the daily massacre of ten thousand men, women, and children, some buried alive, at Babi Yar? Woe unto us, for the killer's imagination surpassed that of his victims. Furthermore, by pushing the crime to its ultimate limits he deprived us of the language to speak of his crime.

What, then, do we wish the future visitor to remember, to learn? The fragility of the human condition? The vulnerability of culture and education? The monstrous powers of political fanaticism? The dangers inherent in indifference? The fact that it was possible for an evil regime to consider cynically, calmly, scientifically, the annihilation of an entire people and be persuaded of its right and obligation to do so? All this is part of the tale—and more, much more.

Some lessons may have an immediate and urgent effect. Terror must be fought wherever it is aimed against innocent civilians. Individual terror that cost the life of an old Jewish invalid is today as abhorrent as state terror was when, from Hitler's Berlin, it dominated part of Europe from 1933 to 1945.

Terror must be outlawed as must genocide. We cannot leave this place today without appealing once more to the United States Senate to ratify the Genocide Treaty introduced by CHRIS DODD. I am not sure whether such treaties will prevent mass murder, but the absence of such treaties may give the enemy of humankind the wrong signal. Would a Genocide Treaty have prevented the murder of the Jews by the Nazis? I doubt it. But its absence gave the enemy of humankind the wrong signal.

In killing Jews the killer has killed more than Jews. This tragedy has affected more than its Jewish victims. Whoever kills Jews ends up killing other minorities, other adversaries, other religious groups, other nationalities.

In occupied Europe, the Nazis and their local accomplices, oppressed, tormented, persecuted, imprisoned and executed French heroes of the resistance, Yugoslav and Greek and Russian partisans, Ukrainian peasants, Bulgarian and Polish patriots, Dutch workers, Belgian students, Norwegian intellectuals, Danish policemen, German and Austrian anti-Nazi militants, Italian anti-Fascists, Czechoslovakian freedom fighters. Lidice and Oradour are but extreme examples of what SS rulers intended to do—and often did—throughout their universe in order to crush those who refused to submit to their terror. And they eliminated Gypsies, homosexuals, the mentally retarded, the mentally sick. Using death as an instrument, they sought to rearrange the universe so as to give violence and injustice the attributes of divinity.

But their main effort was directed against the Jewish people. "Who remembers the Armenians?" Hitler asked with disdain. Who will remember the Jews?

In a perverse way, he was right. No one cared about the Jews. They were abandoned. The world knew and kept silent. Hitler knew that the world knew—and thus felt reassured in his belief that he was doing humankind a favor by cleansing it of its Jewish elements. And so more ghettos were erected and emptied, more communities uprooted and massacred. How are we to remember them? If we could inscribe their names on stone, the monument would be larger than this entire city. What other way is there for us to turn past experiences into acts of remembrance? What should we emphasize first? The helplessness of the victim? The inexorable urge of the killer to destroy? The children, frightened children, marching quietly in procession toward the flames? The old men and women chased toward mass graves? In those times we were a people without children, and children without grandparents. We have seen them vanish into darkness and ascend an invisible ladder of fire reaching the sky.

One enters those memories with fear and trembling; for one's sanity is endangered. But we must enter them. We open them as one opens gates to secret kingdoms. Come and see. Come and learn. Learn what human beings can do to other human beings. Learn the limits of humanity. Learn, and hope is possible—forget, and despair is inevitable.

This Museum is not intended to awaken hatred nor to separate people—quite the opposite: it is meant to bring people closer together. Faced with our memories, the visitor will have no choice but to become more sensitive to his or her fellow being's anguish.

One day a child will stop here and ask his father: what is this building about? They will go inside. After a while the child will ask his father: is all this true? have so many killers really killed so many victims in so many cruel ways? Yes—will say the father. In those times the angel of death had many faces and many allies. But, why? the child will ask. Why have all those victims perished?

Why has the catastrophe occurred? I wonder what the father's answer will be.

I know what mine is: I do not know. I do not know why the Holocaust happened. I will never know; no one ever will.

Why Theresienstadt? Why Ravensbruck? Why Belzec? Why Treblinka? Why Auschwitz?

Why the indifference of allied leaders? Why the silence our common enemies? Why the abandonment of the Jews?

In this Museum we shall try to tell the story. We shall try to recall what happened—to whom—by whom—and how it happened. But not why it happened. God alone may have some answers—and, in the

case of one million Jewish children consumed by flames—all answers are the wrong answers.

The killer killed them once—and there is nothing on earth that we can do about it. But, if they are forgotten, they will be killed a second time—and this we can—and must—prevent.

A great Hasidic Master once said, "if you wish to find the spark, look for it in the ashes."

GOOD NEWS ABOUT SMALL BUSINESS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot these days about the plight of business in America. People everywhere are talking about trade deficits and the threat of imports to our domestic manufacturing base. But we need to take a few moments and look beyond this smokescreen of bad news.

There is an incredible new spirit of personal initiative rising in this country—and the credit belongs to individual Americans across the Nation. We, as a country, enjoy a unique place in history—our energy comes from one of our most abundant resources—the hearts and minds of the American people.

This Nation has no mission of mediocrity—we were never meant to be second best. It is this bold spirit—one of pride, confidence, and courage—that continues to allow us to achieve our dreams.

Let's talk a moment about small business in America.

Small business is the backbone of Main Street America. American entrepreneurs continue to be the frontrunners in innovation, research, and development. And they create jobs.

As a member of the Small Business Committee, I take a very personal interest in the continued success of small business; and I am always encouraged when I hear new success stories—high startup rates, rising sales, and increased innovation.

The Census Bureau gave us more good news last week—the number of black-owned firms in this country rose substantially from 1977 to 1982. It is estimated that there could be more than 434,000 black-owned businesses by yearend.

Black entrepreneurs are discovering new opportunities at every turn, they are reaching out in new directions, especially high technological and service industries. And the vast majority of these black businesses are sole proprietorships where families are working together to succeed. This is indeed good news for America.

The story, however, is more than just plain statistics.

According to the Census Bureau, much of the recent growth among black-owned businesses is attributed to the economic recession of the 1970's. As many individuals were laid off, these same people went into business on their own. Now, while a recession is never good news, there is a point here worth recognizing. We as Americans, have the ability—when the going gets rough—to dig deep down inside that strong will and creative spirit which helped build this great Nation. And we are successful.

We lead the world in innovations. Do you realize that from 1980 to 1983, Americans received a total of 68 percent of the Nobel Prize awards for science? In 1983, we actually took them all. Not a bad track record.

Yes, business is booming in America. The youth of today, no matter what their ethnic or social background, can have great hopes for their future. America is embarking on a massive peaceful revolution, and the revolutionaries come from all sectors of our melting pot society, blacks, whites, orientals, hispanics—who recognize the great promise of opportunity which America offers.

We must ignore the prophets of failure who are paralyzed with fear. We must set our sights ever and ever higher. We can achieve our dreams by continuing to be the America whose initiative, ingenuity and audacity have made us the envy of the world. Ours is an opportunity society, and we must continue to offer an environment in which individuals, no matter how humble their beginnings, can develop their full potential.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the vitality of our small businesses is another reason we can truly—feel good about America.

□ 1635

INSURED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 1985

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

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker today my colleague from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, and I are introducing legislation which addresses one of the most fundamental problems facing our Nation's network of financial institutions.

One of the basic ingredients of a sound national banking system must be consistent and effective examination of federally insured financial institutions. Through regular and rigorous reviews of banks, thrifts and credit unions, potential problems can be caught early. Many of the problems which our system has experienced in the last year or so could have been caught and dealt with earlier through more diligent examination procedures. For example, inadequacies in our current examination procedures were cited during congressional hearings and other discussions are contributing to last year's near failure of Continental Illinois.

The key to an effective, efficient examination system is competent and highly trained examiners. The periodical examination of financial institutions is, as one can imagine, a very time consuming and arduous process which requires a high level of training. Examiners are required to travel a great deal and work under very stressful conditions. In many parts of the country, the pay for these professionals is far below what they could earn in the private sector. Consequently, many of the best examiners do not remain in Government service for more than 4 or 5 years.

The bill which Congressman CARPER and I are introducing today, the "Insured Financial Institutions Examination Act of 1985," addresses many of the problems currently plaguing our Federal examination structure. First, the bill removes Federal examiners from Federal civil service pay scales and establishes pay scales that are roughly comparable to those in private industry. These new pay scales would be based upon geographic location, length of service and experience, and levels of training and responsibility. Second, the bill provides for the consolidation and upgrading of the training of all Federal examiners. Presently, each regulatory agency trains its own examiners. Our bill would require that the examiners of the Federal Reserve Board, The Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board all undergo the same training program. Because training for examiners is paid for through assessments on the various insurance funds, these changes will not cost the taxpayer any money, nor will such changes have any budgetary impact. In fact, we estimate that there will be an overall savings from such consolidation, and our bill dictates that any such savings be used to hire more examiners. Finally, our bill will provide for more coordination between Federal and State examiners for State-chartered institutions that are federally insured.

While there have been hearings in both the House and Senate on proposals to reform the Federal deposit insurance system, and while I applaud the committees' efforts in this area, the question of the adequacy of current review and examination procedures must also be addressed. In a very real sense, the competence and experience of those who examine our Nation's financial institutions affect us all. We must recruit the most talented people to perform this difficult task. We cannot afford to have the most knowledgeable and conscientious ex-

aminers leave Government service after a few years for the more lucrative world of the private sector.

Over 25 members of the House Banking Committee are already cosponsors of this bill, and I hope that other Members of the House will join us in this effort. Thank you.

WORLD FOOD DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to focus the attention of this body on today's observance of World Food Day. Recent events such as the "live aid" concert and the USA for Africa production of "We Are the World" only in part document the incredible contribution that thousands of Americans are making toward ending world hunger.

Since 1979, the National Committee for World Food Day, under the leadership of its distinguished chairwoman, Patricia Young, and the auspices of the World Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] has undertaken hundreds of projects and programs related to the world's hunger problem. Without World Food Day and the organizations involved with its celebration, the groundswell needed that made the recent media events possible would never have existed.

Americans can be proud of the fact that one-half of all the food committed this year to Africa has been donated by the United States. Individuals have contributed over $125 million to private voluntary organizations such as "care" and "save the children."

Additionally, the U.S. Government has sent a total of $1.25 billion for the drought since the emergency first came to national attention last October. This is in addition to $1 billion the U.S. Government is spending on non-emergency projects in Africa this year.

Yet, despite this impressive outpouring of support, the problem of world hunger persists. According to a recent FAO report, some countries in Africa are still being impacted by drought—over 150 million people. And 13 million are at immediate risk of dying. Unicef informs us that every 24 hours, 42,000 children under the age of 5 die as a result of hunger and related diseases.

These grim statistics underscore the critical need for a continued commitment of private and Government funds to ending hunger. But emergency relief aid is not enough. A concerted effort must be made to improve the deteriorating conditions that result in tragedy after tragedy—the same conditions that allow famine and starvation to persist and remain a reality in a world with more than enough resources to feed its population. It is time for us, for our Nation and the world of nations, to work to prevent disasters from occurring—to solve the problems which face Africa now.

Recently, I introduced H.R. 2782, legislation to prevent famine in Africa, which responds to the root of the problem that faces a continent whose population is growing at the fastest rate in the world—3 percent per year—while at the same time the productivity of its land is declining rapidly. Since 1967, Africa's grain output per person has dropped by nearly one-third and 40 percent of the continent's people live in countries where grain yields are lower than a generation ago.

In order to help Africa become self-sufficient and economically independent, there must be a global effort made to restore and preserve its own productive resources.

Reversing Africa's decline will involve immediate response to the crisis of decertification—that is, degeneration of land's productivity—which results from overly intensive and exploitative use of land in response to the needs of the growing population. At this point in time, 77.2 percent of the 4,500 million hectares of dryland in the world are already affected by decertification and 21 million of these per year are reduced to near or total uselessness. If this trend is not reversed, there will be no end to Africa's dependency on more developed countries for food and economic assistance.

A major cause of Africa's current problems is the lack of a renewable energy supply. Firewood, the most widely used source of fuel, is becoming increasingly scarce due to the overharvesting of trees. Forests in coastal West Africa were being cleared at a rate of 5 percent per year in the early eighties; at that rate, in 13 years those forests will be half of their original size. The scarcity of trees also has implications for soil and crop quality. Trees help to prevent soil erosion caused by damaging winds and floods. Without any protection, soil ceases to be fertile enough to produce significant quantitiesr of food.

Simply to maintain Africa's present per capita food consumption, agricultural output will have to grow 50 to 60 percent between the year 1980-2000. Considering the monumental suffering that exists with the present level of food consumption, it is clear that drastic measures must be taken to revive Africa's capacity to produce.

The time has come to begin to turn back the tide of the degradation of Africa's agricultural resource base that should be providing food for that continent's people. The decertification and deforestation which have played a major role in causing the present catastrophe in Africa needs our immediate attention if we are to put an end to this cycle of famine.

Mr. Speaker, we have the ability, the technology and the wherewithall to end world hunger. All we need is the commitment—and I urge my colleagues to help rally that kind of commitment.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], who has been the chairman of our Select Committee on Hunger, and who for so many years has led the fight in this Congress to stamp out world hunger.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and certainly want to commend him for his leadership, not just now to present this issue to the American people today because this is, indeed, a very special day, but also for his leadership historically, for what he has done to bring to the attention of the Congress the matter of ending hunger, world hunger, that is.

So I am happy also to associate myself with all of the remarks the gentleman has made.

Today, World Food Day 1985, is the occasion for the issuance by the U.S. Postal Service of the "help end hunger" stamp throughout the Nation. Please allow me, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Hunger and as chairman of the Postal Operations and Services Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to express my pride in the issuance of the stamp. Let me at this time thank especially former Postmaster General Bolger and the current Postmaster General Carlin for their efforts. Without their help the stamp never would have been created.

The Postal Service has made a great contribution to the effort to end hunger by enabling us to send 120 million messages calling on our brother and sister Americans to "help end hunger."

The stamp captures the pathos and vulnerability of hungry individuals, young and old. It evokes a compassionate response, similar to that awakened last year by the visual appearance of the famine stricken Ethiopians on television last year. Mr. Jerry Pinkney, designer of the stamp, reminds us that every person who suffers hunger is unique. In his artistry we see in a child or an old person someone we might know, weakened by lack of adequate nutrition. Aggregate numbers, no matter how startling, do not have the same effect.

The American people have always responded magnificently to such appeals. The magnanimity of our citizens during the past year as hunger stalked much of Africa and the homeless stood in souplines in our cities was extraordinary. Although the countless opportunities for giving in a free socie-

ty make a precise calculation of donated funds and services impossible, an example of the generosity of Americans giving through private agencies can be gained from interaction. This coalition of over 100 private, voluntary organizations involved in developing countries reports its member agencies have received over $125 million in donations from the American public for famine recovery activities in sub-Saharan Africa. Additionally, more than $100 million has been raised to help victims of drought and famine in Africa by USA for Africa and live aid efforts.

The same spirit is being demonstrated in response to domestic hunger and malnutrition. The private sector in the United States has responded to those poor who need food aid regularly or occasionally. There are now more food banks, soup kitchens and church pantries providing food than ever before. An estimate of the food contributed through the Second Harvest, a single organization serving food banks throughout the Nation, is $114 million in 1984.

Private individuals, corporations and voluntary, nonprofit organizations have greatly expanded their efforts to alleviate hunger. But their resources are not sufficient. The interfaith hunger appeal released a report yesterday stating that chronic malnutrition affects 500 million people in the world.

All the needs are not far away. In my own city, Houston, the private agencies report a 30-percent increase in requests for emergency food in 1985. Bread for the World, a broad coalition of Christian churches, surveyed 36 localities across the Nation. In most of the cities and counties surveyed the food need requirements were well beyond the capacities of voluntary groups.

It is clear that food assistance and a new commitment to attacking the conditions that allow hunger in a world of plenty are required. Every individual and every government must act in the consciousness that indeed, "we are the world." Morally, most of us acknowledge that the human family suffers with the pain or loss of any of its members. Yet, we live in a world where 2 million children die each year of measles complicated by malnutrition and lack of health care.

In 1974, the first World Food Conference was convened by the United Nations in Rome. The conference adopted recommendations and pledged to eliminate hunger within 10 years. The failure to achieve that goal was acknowledged last year at a 10th anniversary conference in Addis Ababa. Clearly the task is difficult and requires more than rhetoric. It requires hard choices and sacrifice.

The Interfaith Hunger Appeal report is a clear guide to the challenge ahead. It states the emergency needs and long-term development requirements. It was prepared by Church World Services, Catholic Relief Services and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, three experienced agencies who joined together in an educational effort to address hunger in 1978.

The report states that "famine and hunger are more the products of human neglect than of natural phenomena." It calls on all who are in a position to affect public and private policy to do so on behalf of the world's hungry. In a democracy, that's all of us.

The Interfaith Hunger Appeal has given us a document that gives substance to the message of the postal stamp, help end hunger. I commend to your attention on World Food Day an important document significantly entitled "World Food Security: A Personal Responsibility."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your time and certainly want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for not only his time, but also his leadership.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for not only being our leader of our Select Committee on Hunger and for his long-term devotion and dedication to the cause, but for his very comprehensive and moving statement in support of World Food Day.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman.

Let me at this time also commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] for her leadership. She happens to be the ranking minority member on the Select Committee on Hunger.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE], who also has been involved in this issue for many years, and has been a strong supporter of World Food Day concerns.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman and certainly want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his leadership on this issue, and to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], the leaders of our Select Committee on Hunger for their ongoing effort that has been under way for some time now to bring this issue to the attention of the House.

This morning I left the State of Iowa, and as I took off on the plane and flew over our State, I saw hundreds of farmers out there in their fields harvesting crops. It is indeed an abundant crop that they are harvesting in Iowa and across the Midwest this year, because this year our Nation will bring into the bins record amounts of grain and record amounts of food will be stored.

At a time when we are trying to figure out where we can find more storage capacity for food, it must seem strange to many Americans that we still have this problem of world hunger.

As we watch nightly newscast footage of refugee camps for the starving in Ethiopia and other nations of the world, looking at the wasted bodies, the eyes devoid of hope, the barren land, we begin to sense the magnitude of the problem and the scope of the effort that is required to meet the immediate needs of the starving and malnourished of the world. Starvation continues to claim 25 victims worldwide every minute. For nations afflicted with hunger, the road to recovery is long and hard.

But the twin problems of food production and food distribution can be solved if the will of the nations and the peoples of the world is strong enough and our commitment deep enough. I have reason to be optimistic about that will and that commitment. I am optimistic when I read that Americans have contributed $143 million to 34 private voluntary organizations to feed the starving in Africa and that more than 35 million starving people have received nourishment.

I am most optimistic about our ability to sustain this commitment over the long haul ahead when I think of the letter I received last December from Grant Weeks, a fourth-grader from Clinton, IA. I want to share Grant's letter with you:

> DEAR MR. TAUKE: I have seen on the news these people starve in Ethiopia. I know you are a leader in Washington. Could you maybe see that the children have food? I am willing to give the allowance I have been saving. I know you will do what you can do.
>
> GRANT WEEKS.

Grant had enclosed $3.

Grant's letter gives me hope. Our Nation's children realize and understand the problem of world hunger and the need for nations and peoples to work together to solve that problem.

Let us renew our will and our commitment today, World Food Day, to a world in which starvation and malnourishment are specters of the past.

□ 1700

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his supportive remarks and thank him for his long-term commitment to this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], who has been the outstanding minority leader of our Select Committee on Hunger, and who has for so many years been concerned and dedicated to this issue.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague on the

House Select Committee on Hunger, Mr. BENJAMIN GILMAN, in celebrating this October 16 as World Food Day.

Today, the United States is joined by about 150 other countries around the world in highlighting the crucial importance of agriculture and food distribution for survival and good health of individuals and nations.

Today is a time to reflect upon the problem of hunger, how far we have come, and how far we have yet to travel. The problem as I see it, has been to answer the question of why do we even have this problem at all? Since we, as a nation, produce more and spend more on food aid, why do we have overabundance and the tragedy of hunger at the same time? Why does this problem continue to stay ahead of our capacity to solve it? Why with all our resources, can we not better match supply and need? We know the questions. We must search for answers.

The African famine has captured the hearts and souls of the American people, and illuminated the problem of hunger in tragic proportions. As the ranking Republican on the Select Committee on Hunger, I had the opportunity to view this crisis first-hand with a group of my House colleagues during a trip to Ethiopia last year. Words cannot describe the anguish I felt at Korem and Mekele and other refugee camps. My sense of helplessness was overwhelming.

When I saw with my own eyes tens of thousands of persons in Ethiopia weakened by hunger and near starvation, I joined with my Hunger Committee colleagues and sent an urgent message to President Reagan. We informed him that food aid was needed immediately. Our action and the President's answer to our call led to the diversion of a ship that was en route elsewhere and its grain was made available to famine victims of Ethiopia.

Actually, the past year has seen one of the worst famines in human history. For the third year in a row, half or more of the countries of Africa have faced food emergencies. Tens of millions of persons faced the threat of death by starvation and hunger-related illness. U.S. resources were mobilized and massive food shipments were sent by our Agency for International Development [AID] to many African countries.

Our President and the Congress embraced as a national policy of our country the principle that "the starving child knows no politics." This principle has been applied by AID, under the able and energetic leadership of Mr. M. Peter McPherson, in providing aid to all those African countries suffering food shortages in the current African famine. The United States has led all donor nations in providing 3 million metric tons of food to the African nations in need. Those numbers are truly impressive. More meaningful is the fact that they have saved millions of lives.

However, there is a great deal that remains to be done.

There is an excellent new book, edited by the Hunger Project, entitled "Ending Hunger, an Idea Whose Time Has Come." The idea of ending hunger has been brought home to tens of millions of Americans by news reports of the African famine, the "We Are the World" song of United Support of Artists for Africa—USA for Africa—the Live-Aid Concert, and hundreds of hunger-related activities across our land. Americans' private contributions in the past year exceeded $200 million in lifesaving assistance.

We know the problems are severe. We know that many lives depend each day on our work. We know that the massive efforts required have been begun. We have a lot more to do.

Yesterday, the U.S. Postal Service issued a new national stamp. Its message is simple: "Help End Hunger." It was private citizen Phyllis Alroy of Princeton, NJ, who led a national campaign to obtain the signatures of tens of thousands of Americans in support of the "Help End Hunger" stamp. Hunger Committee Chairman LELAND pressed the idea in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and won key support for it. As World Food Day comes and goes, I am hopeful that this national stamp will help seal our efforts throughout the year in alleviating hunger. I urge that all of us who can buy this special stamp now, while it is available, and use it to send out our mail through the coming months. It will help keep the "end hunger" message going across our land and around the world, as we send our mail to other countries.

In my home State of New Jersey, Governor Kean issued a special call to the people of our State to capture the spirit of World Food Day. Rev. John Barton, working with Church World Service/Crop, is a leader of New Jersey's impressive array of World Food Day activities. I am sure that the people of New Jersey will heed the call of World Food Day, as will millions of others across the land. Indeed, many in New Jersey have been leading the call already.

One such person is Victor Cino. This May, a resident of Tenafly, NJ, through his own desire to help the world's neediest, with untiring energy, organized the New Jersey Council on African Relief. He now chairs this council, comprised of many organizations in the State that are active in overseas hunger relief efforts, including emergency shipments of medicines. Mr. Cino's success certainly shows that an individual with commitment and hard work can work with others and save lives. If there were time, I could report on the individual, corporate, and group contributions of many others, as well. They all deserve our hearty commendation.

To carry the spirit of World Food Day forward, I have cosponsored the House resolution to have November 24, the Sunday before Thanksgiving, designated as the "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger." The resolution encourages Americans who are able to forgo one or more meals and contribute the money saved to a hunger-relief organization of their choice. This will give us each a special chance to experience hunger concerns more personally while raising substantial sums help to those who suffer from hunger.

Crisis intervention does not substitute for our long-term development goals. We must take care to help prepare the recipient nations to begin to provide for their own basic needs. There is a point at which emergency food can deter local food production. We must avoid that counterproductive result. Our goal must be to meet critical emergency needs while promoting self-sufficiency, not dependency. We must ensure that these nations do not become permanent wards of the world.

We must help bring the benefits of a new "green revolution" to Africa. The United States supports African development through the transfer of agricultural technology and aid assistance. Indeed, our participation in the World Bank's International Development Association [IDA], the International Fund for Agricultural Development [IFAD], and the FAO has created many local success stories. For instance, IFAD's role is to work with the poorest rural farmers in the developing world to assist them in enhancing their food production. If we are to help the sub-Saharan region of Africa overcome the current crisis and move toward self-sufficiency, we must direct our attention to the small farmer on whom this region relies. Each of these programs remains crucial to the momentum of agricultural innovation.

However, without fundamental changes in the agricultural, economic, and population policies of governments, the seeds of progress sown by agricultural innovation will fail to flower. We must work to change the ill-conceived and regressive perceptions of governments that view agriculture as the primitive sector of their economies, to be tolerated and taxed solely for the benefit of the urban and industrial sectors. Only when this antiagricultural mindset of post-colonial Africa changes, can genuine progress be made toward the elimination of the conditions that foster these catastrophic famines.

Clearly, a massive effort by numerous governments, international organizations, private groups, and millions of

individuals is required to end the scourge of hunger. I stand with my fellow Members of Congress, with the President and our executive agencies, and with those in the private sector who are dedicated to ending hunger in our time.

I wish to commend Hunger Committee member, BENJAMIN GILMAN, for proposing the World Food Day resolution, the President for again answering our call and leading our national observance, the more than 300 American groups and organization members of the National Committee for World Food Day for their mobilization of local support, and the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization [UN/FAO] for its leading work toward food security for all peoples.

We can all be proud of the leading role our country and so many of its private citizens and organizations have played in the alleviation of hunger and malnutrition in the United States and in other countries around the world. Sadly, we cannot rest on our past accomplishments and just return to our every day lives satisfied that we have done what we could and more than any others have done.

We cannot because the crisis of food shortages in many countries and in many individual households in all countries persists. The solutions lie in long-term efforts to increase food production in the poorest countries and to improve international distribution and incountry delivery systems.

World Food Day is based on the important idea that the people of the world should share in a partnership in the search for solutions to the problems of hunger and malnutrition. I hope that our national commemoration of World Food Day will lead millions of Americans to listen, read, and reflect on the continuing problems of hunger affecting millions of persons daily. More importantly, I hope that it will encourage many to contact domestic and international organizations that are working to solve hunger problems and to form lasting links with them in their ongoing efforts to alleviate hunger and malnutrition in our time.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] not only for her leadership as our ranking minority member of our Select Committee on Hunger, but also for her extensive work in finding new initiatives for helping us to resolve this critical issue of world hunger.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman again.

□ 1710

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we take this time to commemorate World Food Day and to reflect on the problem of world hunger, very few of us can help from feeling a great sense of the tragedy that hunger represents. The fact that hunger will claim the lives of millions of people throughout the world each year is truely distressing. It is easy to be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problem, and by what seems to be our inability to ease the pain of all those who suffer. However, we have a responsibility both as legislators and as concerned Americans to continue the fight against hunger with vigor that cannot be relaxed.

While the extent of hunger throughout the world is undoubtedly a great tragedy, what seems to me to be an even greater atrocity is the fact that here, in the land of plenty, we have millions of people who too will go to bed every night hungry, and who suffer the ill effects of malnutrition. An estimated 34.4 million people live below the poverty line, and, as a result, are denied a nutritionally adequate diet. The evidence of hunger in America is pouring in as souplines and pantry kitchens throughout the Nation report a doubling, even a tripling of people seeking their assistance. Sadly, those who are seeking emergency food assistance are families with children who were once able to make it financially. Unfortunately, unemployment and the rising cost of living and energy have forced many of our citizens to seek the assistance of private charities. I am touched by the effort of our courageous citizens who donate so much of their time, energy, and resources to aid the hungry. Here or abroad however, the message they are sending to Washington is clear: Private charities and food banks simply do not have the resources or ability to meet the needs of the rising population of hungry Americans.

Much has been said over the past 6 years about the need to reduce the Federal deficit. I wholeheartedly agree that this is a major problem and must be addressed. However, I question the wisdom on cutting back on programs that are designed to assist the hungry. A healthy population is as essential to America as is our national defense. It seems ironic to me that so much of our resources will be placed on bombs and nuclear weaponry, while many of our children will suffer from malnutrition. Across the street from the White House there is a park full of the homeless and hungry who live in the streets, picking through trash for their meals, and seeking shelter in subways from the cold winter nights. This scenario occurs in every city throughout the Nation. Do we not have a responsibility to these people? Are they not our brothers and sisters? I believe that our budget priorities should incorporate the basic values of human rights, which include the right to a sound and healthy diet.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from California for his pertinent comments and for his dedication to this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a recent article, a feature article, prepared by the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Africa, a Blueprint for Survival," written by David K. Willis, who has been the Monitor's Third World correspondent for a number of years.

I would like to quote from a portion of that which is headed, "A Blueprint for African Survival," which summarizes the principles set forth in this article.

Mr. Speaker, it states as follows:

A BLUEPRINT FOR AFRICAN SURVIVAL

Recognize that to fight famine in the long term, African earth, water, trees, and livestock need urgent help to survive.

Help to lower population growth rates, the highest in the world, with sustained cooperation between aid donors and local governments, stressing positive benefits rather than negative fears.

Help primarily the small African farmer by:

1. Refocusing aid away from huge, showcase projects originated by urban planners largely to benefit urban populations, and into local, specific ideas to boost subsistence crops.

2. Involving African women much more in aid planning and projects at all levels. Women perform up to 80 percent of all tasks connected with food production. No longer can plans be laid by males for males on the assumption that males grow the food Africans eat.

Aid local farmers not in high-tech but in low-tech ways.

Provide more money for intensified research into the higher-yielding, hardier, drought-resistant crops that are eaten in tropical and arid climates (millet, sorghum, maize [corn], cassava, yams, cowpeas, and more).

Finance much more drilling for underground water across the Sahel region, in Ethiopia, Sudan, and northern Kenya, as well as more catchments, mini-ponds, terracing, and no-till farming techniques to conserve the rain that does fall.

Vastly expand farm extension work, especially to spread the word that "slash and burn" shifting cultivation no longer works, because populations are growing too fast to allow land to lie fallow for the long periods it takes to recover.

Adopt plans drawn up by a UNESCO unit in Kenya to limit the number of livestock carried on semiarid lands. Nomadic pastoralists who settle around grain-distribution points must send out herders to keep moving their camels from pasture to pasture rather than keeping them near the home base.

Balance the competing needs of livestock and wild game where drought hits hard.

Persuade the United States and Europe to concentrate much more on diplomacy aimed at easing Africa's ruinous civil wars, which divert resources, block distribution, and

keep too many eyes focused on the short term rather than on the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thought these suggestions were worthy of our review, and I hope that my colleagues will take a good, hard look at these constructive proposals.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, today I rise to speak to you about world hunger. Given that we live in a kind of "media age," what we pay attention to often depends on what is prominent in the media at the moment.

An apartment-house fire, an airplane crash, a murder—these are the items of interest that make up our daily news diet. As discrete events, relevant largely only to the current moment, they come and go in our lives with little real impact. They speak to no enduring concern.

The persistence of world hunger is one of those issues that permeates the background of life. With the exception of the occasional news making events, typically, a famine, in which the human disaster is so acute that it cannot be ignored, hunger lives as a process, a persistent, and chronic condition. People are dying from hunger everyday and because this is the norm, it is not news.

For those of us who are adequately fed and for whom food is commonplace in our daily life, hunger—if it is thought of at all—is something out there—something tragic—horrible—awful—something we wish did not exist. It is not, however something we keep front and center as one of our primary and fundamental concerns.

According to a recent study by "The Hunger Project," 1 billion people are chronically undernourished; 13 to 18 million people die a year from hunger, 35,000 people a day, 24 people a minute, 18 of whom are children, die from hunger. Yet, because we view hunger in the background of life, this terrible toll does not enter our headlines, nor, for most of us, our concerns.

As I stated during the debate on the Food Security Act, the policy of our Government has been to pay farmers not to produce crops in an effort to keep commodity prices at profitable levels. Meanwhile, millions of people go undernourished here and in Third World countries. Whatever the reasons were or are for this policy, growing domestic and world hunger begs this question—"Should we be in the business of paying farmers not to grow food? In light of both domestic and world hunger, the answer is a crystal clear "no."

We need to really reassess and re-think the guiding principals on which we base our farm policies. If there is a problem with storing excess commodities—lets correct it. If there is a problem with marketing excess commodities—lets correct it. If there is a problem with giving food to hungry people, by all means—let's correct it. In light of domestic and world hunger, how long can we continue to pay farmers not to produce food? How long are we going to suppress the resources of our food producing industry simply to line the pockets of a few with inflated profits?

All of us have been "hungry" at some time or other. This usually means simply that we have an appetite. But the hunger experienced by hundreds of millions of people is not an appetite that comes and goes; it is a consuming, debilitating, minute-by-minute, day-after-day experience. Hunger—the presistent, chronic, relentless condition—keeps people from working productively and thinking clearly. It decreases their resistance to disease, and is intensely painful. Prolonged hunger can result in permanent damage to the body and mind. Ultimately, as the number of deaths I mentioned earlier indicate, if hunger goes on long enough, it kills.

Mr. Speaker, we must address the hunger crisis now. It is widespread and it is increasing. The time to react has passed. The time to act is now.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues on the Select Committee on Hunger for organizing this colloquy in celebration of World Food Day. There is no doubt that hunger is a very real and pressing problem in today's world.

We can be proud of the fact that by all measures, the United States has taken the lead in providing relief of all kinds to the drought-stricken areas of Africa. In the last year, we have provided over 3 million metric tons of food to Africa, valued at just over $1 billion. This is roughly 6 times the amount provided in fiscal year 1984.

Funds appropriated in fiscal year 1985 and added to in the March supplemental appropriations bill should be sufficient to meet the critical food needs for most of Africa. Substantial rains have come to many drought areas, however, due to population displacement and land damage, the upcoming harvest will still be subnormal. The situation is certainly not great, but it is considerably better than at this time last year.

The most critical problem at the moment is the lack of transportation to get the food to those who need it. While the supplemental provided adequate funds for food relief, it was clearly insufficient in the transportation and other nonfood aid provisions. Food in Ethiopia is not rotting on the docks, as some have said, but it is piling up in storage facilities and backing up in the system. If there is not an immediate effort to provide trucks, gasoline, spare parts, and some airplanes, the food storage will become critical. The deplorable state of Ethiopia's infrastructure is not atypical of most of the other famine-stricken nations. At this time, AID has no plans to provide further transportation assistance.

Another serious need in the famine-effected areas is health assistance. Disease is a big problem, and could become an even greater threat if living conditions are not improved and medical assistance does not reach large numbers of people.

A new supplemental request for nonfood aid may well be needed to address the critical problems of transportation and health assistance. I hope that this body will continue to monitor the situation closely and be ready to take action if necessary.

I feel strongly that we must carefully assess not only the efficiency of our relief efforts in response to the Africa famine crisis, but also the background of economic development and foreign assistance prior to the crisis. While providing emergency food assistance is obviously of great importance, it is even more crucial that we restructure our ongoing development efforts so as to help prevent these types of disasters. We must evaluate the effectiveness of our foreign aid efforts in addressing the long-range needs of Africa and other developing nations. We must also lend our support to those international organizations, such as the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, that are doing such a commendable job of addressing the long-term development needs of the Third World. For after all, these countries do not want our food so much as they want to be able to feed themselves.

While world hunger is a well recognized problem, there is also a growing hunger problem here at home. Reports done in recent years point to large increases in the demand for emergency food. Bread for the World's recently released 1985 "Hunger Watch U.S.A." survey reports a 16.2-percent increase in the average number of people served monthly by emergency food assistance sites in the past year. Other disturbing statistics show that increasing numbers of families are finding it difficult to feed their children. The U.S. Conference of Mayors reports that the number of families and children requesting emergency food aid increased by over 35 percent in 1984 alone. Adequate funding for Domestic Nutrition Assistance Program is the key to bringing hunger in the United States under control.

There is no doubt that the resources exist to solve the problems of hunger. What is needed is the will to do so. I encourage all my colleagues in Congress to join in working for a solution to this problem.

Mr. TOWNS, Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth observance of World Food Day and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization. These events make today's special order an appropriate time to address hunger concerns.

There are many people at home and abroad who are suffering from serious nutrition deficiencies. The number of men, women, and children who are dying from starvation and dietary deficiencies has reached crisis proportions. It shocks the conscience to know that this day of highly advanced technology and agricultural development, we still have millions of people, here at home and abroad, whose basic dietary needs are not being met. This situation is indeed a very sad commentary on the world community and perhaps more importantly, our Nation.

On this day of observance, we must rededicate ourselves to the elimination of world hunger. However, let me add these words of caution. It will be very difficult to show the world community that we are genuinely committed to this just and noble

cause if we are not equally committed and determined to elimnate hunger in America. We cannot very well attack the problem of world hunger without first eliminating domestic hunger.

There are still too many hungry Americans across this Nation and the figures are rising. The sharp increase in the early 1980's was thought to be a short-term increase caused primarily by the recession, high unemployment, and reductions in Federal public assistance programs; that is, AFDC families, food stamps and other nutritional programs. The trend since the early 1980's has been one of declining Federal support to those who need Federal assistance the most. According to the most recent report of Hunger Watch U.S.A., between fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1985, the Food Stamp Program was cut by over $7 billion from its pre-1982 levels. Furthermore, the effect of the reduction has been to terminate benefits to over 1 million people and reduce benefits to virtually all other eligible beneficiaries. These cutbacks and the resulting ramifications are not indicative of a Congress which has committed itself to the elimination of hunger throughout the world. The Food Stamp Program desperately needs to be expanded to allow more households to participate.

This program is only one avenue which should be pursued in an effort to reduce the level of hunger in the United States. Let's us demonstrate to the world that we view hunger as the No. 1 issue at home and abroad in the 1980's.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in a Capitol Hill setting, at a ceremony hosted by the Select Committee on Hunger and attended by the Postmaster General of the United States, 10 individuals received citations for their extraordinary efforts to end world hunger. From all parts of the country, all ages and walks of life they came, in honor of the first day of issue of a U.S. Postal Service stamp bearing the legend "Help End Hunger." One of the persons honored, Dorsey Lawson of Pasadena, CA, came from the 22d District of California which I represent.

Dorsey Lawson is not just dedicated to this cause; for her it is a way of life. The name of her support group really says it all, "Results." Dorsey by her steadfast devotion to a cause shows us all what it takes to make a difference in the lives of others. Dorsey represents the meaning of individual effort at its very best. She never forgets, and she never lets you forget, and we are all the better for it.

Today is World Food Day 1985; a day on which we can truly celebrate the good news that since 1961, 51 countries representing over 1.5 billion people have ended hunger as a national issue within their borders. It is also a day during which we can pay homage to Dorsey Lawson and her counterparts all over this Earth for their remarkable efforts to first bring the crisis to our attention, to take action and then most important of all to be able to show "results." That is what this day is all about and that is what Dorsey Lawson is all about.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of World Food Day.

In 1979, the then 147-member nations of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations passed the resolution establishing World Food Day. They hoped that an internationally celebrated event would focus public attention on the gravity of the world food situation, particularly in developing countries, and would stimulate public participation in efforts to over come hunger.

Today, hundreds of thousands will gather to express and reaffirm in their own way, their commitment to end hunger. They will focus compassion, energy, and vision on helping to develop comprehensive farm, food, and health policies—policies which increase the availability of nutritious food for all. In this individual commitment, by people in countries throughout the world, lies the true strength and ability to eliminate hunger and malnutrition.

As I look back over the years, I can see the result of increased concern and united compassion for the hungry. Hunger groups have grown and developed into widely effective organizations. Through efforts of these groups, individuals and policymakers have become more educated and directed in their approach to eliminate hunger permanently.

While our country has not yet succeeded in eliminating domestic hunger, indeed we have witnessed an increase in the past few years, our country has been able to respond to hunger with a broad and often successful attack, using mechanisms which have taken years to develop.

Today we have established food banks, procedures for commercial and governmental contributions to food distribution programs, school lunch and breakfast programs, distribution of surplus commodities, child nutrition, and the Women, Infant and Children [WIC] Programs, and food stamps.

This ability to respond has improved tremendously since 1935, when Congress first directed the U.S. Department of Agriculture to operate food assistance programs aiding the low-income population, and to purchase and donate surplus farm commodities to school lunch programs serving low-income populations.

In the late 1960's, President Kennedy launched an all-out campaign to eliminate hunger. And we made strong progress. In 1961, the first pilot Food Stamp Program began operation. Over a decade later, in 1972, the first supplemental food program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC] was mandated. These programs were expanded and improved through the 1970's, and they seemed to be working.

However, 1980 was a hard year on food assistance programs. Child Nutrition Program funds were reduced, school lunch subsidy rates were reduced, nutrition education programs, breakfast programs and others suffered setbacks. Since 1980, the Nation, and the world as a whole, has suffered from the recession. Reports have indicated that there is a growing number of children admitted into hospitals who are showing symptoms likely to be nutrition related. Demand for emergency assistance has risen faster than the ability of food assistance programs to respond.

The occurrence of hunger internationally has been underlined by the tragic drought in Africa. Millions of Africans face hunger and the threat of starvation daily. Yet, there has been an incredible response to this famine. Shortly after the BBC broadcast last fall, the relief organizations from the United States witnessed a flood of contributions for the drought victims. While the U.S. Government has sent emergency food aid, and other assistance, private citizens have also contributed food, money, and their time. We have seen a variety of group efforts—the live-aid concert, fundraising functions, and community benefits—to raise funds. The concern felt for the plight of the famine victims has resulted in one of the largest broad-reaching fundraising efforts to battle hunger in history, and has saved millions of lives.

No; we have not yet eliminated hunger. We have not been successful in feeding all the Africans or those who are starving in other areas of our world. Yet, we have established a momentum. And, we have proved what can be accomplished when we try.

World Food Day is an event to encourage this determination to eliminate hunger. And, we must be careful not to let our enthusiasm wane.

As the richest nation in the world, we feel a moral obligation to share our abundance of food with others less fortunate than ourselves.

The United States is the No. 1 agricultural producer in the world. It is a national shame to have people go hungry in a land as wealthy as ours.

We are now viewing hunger and malnutrition as a health risk as we learn more about the effects of inadequate nutrition and its impact on the health of the elderly, expectant mothers, newborn and growing children.

We must recognize the ills of hunger from an educational point of view; hunger and inadequate nutrition can reduce the ability of our children, tomorrow's leaders, to concentrate and learn.

Finally, policymakers are beginning to view hunger from a cost perspective. It has been estimated that for every dollar we spend on providing good nutrition domestically, we can save up to $3 dollars in health care costs and in the loss of good education.

Yet, an effective program for eliminating hunger requires much more than emergency food assistance. We must develop a more permanent approach which addresses the causes of hunger and malnutrition.

Hunger and malnutrition occur for a variety of reasons: unfair and uneven distribution of wealth; lack of a social system to help the disabled, the young, and the old; shortages or uneven distribution of food—created by natural or political restrictions; inability for a community to be food self-

sufficient; social and cultural factors regarding right to food; and ignorance.

In America, hunger is not a result of a limited food supply, but the inability to pay for it. Government benefits alone will not be the solution to eliminating this problem. What we really must strive for is insuring an adequate supply of nutritious foods at affordable prices to all citizens.

Avoiding artifically high prices, encouraging urban and individual gardening projects, instituting direct farmer-to-consumer marketing, reducing unemployment, and encouraging food and personal contributions to community assistance programs for the needy will all serve as important foundations for increasing the availability of nutritious foods.

Increasing our understanding of nutrition, both nationally through research, and individually through education is vital. It is estimated that one out of every seven Americans is malnourished or has a deficiency in one or more essential vitamins or minerals. For a large portion of these people, this is not due to hunger, but rather poor eating habits and ignorance regarding nutrition. Our schools can and should offer nutrition education, but more needs to be done to educate all our citizens regarding food consumption and the need for proper nutrition.

Because I feel strongly that nutrition research and on-going nutrition monitoring of our citizens is essential to assessing and increasing our country's health, I have introduced, along with my colleagues Congressmen MACKAY and WALGREN, the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1985.

On an international level, communication and cooperation is important to win the battle against hunger. The famine in Africa has resulted in increased efforts to coordinate food assistance with other countries. And I hope this trend will continue in the future.

However, just as in America, direct food assistance will not result in a permanent reduction of hunger. Increased education, technology transfer, developing low-resource, sustainable agriculture systems applicable to each area, natural resource conservation and maintenance programs, and social and political involvement is needed.

Today, we have the resources, the knowledge, and the ability to reduce—even eliminate—hunger. What we lack is the needed commitment of our world leaders, of our community leaders, and individuals. World Food Day was created to help bring hunger to our attention, and to help foster this commitment.

I commend everyone who has taken part in this effort. From those who have contributed their time to volunteer in food assistance programs or joined education efforts, to those who have contributed or raised money for hunger-related projects, to those who have educated policymakers, to all who have participated in research and the development of technology and knowledge needed to eliminate hunger completely.

We have taken great steps in reducing hunger in our world. I encourage all to join these efforts and to continue to press toward our goal of eliminating hunger in our lifetime.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for arranging this special order on hunger. Representatives MICKEY LELAND, BEN GILMAN, and MARGE ROUKEMA have done an excellent job with the Select Committee on Hunger in making us all aware of the plight of the world's hungry.

Certainly there is no greater cause facing us than to insure that all the world's people are fed. Without this basic need fulfilled, we cannot even begin to hope that the millions of people throughout the world that are hungry—particularly those in the developing world—will be able to have any kind of normal life.

Politics must be cast aside when we consider this issue. Our efforts must, instead, be focused on feeding the hungry no matter where they are, no matter what kind of government they labor under. The best way for us to do this is to continue with efforts such as this—getting Members of Congress together to talk about hunger and what can be done to eliminate it. That's the first step, making people aware of the magnitude of this problem, Hunger is not confined to Ethiopia; it exists throughout Africa, as well as throughout the world.

There is no reason for hunger to continue. I am convinced that if we work together, we have it within our power to end hunger. We, as Members of Congress, must join together and speak with one voice in the fight against hunger. Ending hunger would be the best foreign policy initiative we could possibly undertake.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, as we take this time to commemorate World Food Day and to reflect on the problem of world hunger, very few of us can help from feeling a great sense of the tragedy that hunger represents. The fact that hunger will claim the lives of millions of people throughout the world each year is truly distressing. It is easy to be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problem, and by what seems to be our inability to ease the pain of all those who suffer. However, we have a responsibility both as legislators and as people to continue the fight against hunger with a vigor that cannot be relaxed.

While the extent of hunger throughout the world is undoubtedly a great tragedy, what seems to me to be an even greater atrocity is the fact that here, in the land of plenty, we have millions of people who also will go to bed every night hungry, and who suffer the ill effects of malnutrition. An estimated 34.4 million people live below the poverty line, and, as a result, are denied a nutritionally adequate diet. The evidence of hunger in America is pouring in as soup lines and pantry kitchens throughout the Nation report a doubling, even tripling of people seeking their assistance. Sadly, those who are seeking emergency food assistance are families with children who were once able to make it financially. Unfortunately, unemployment and rising costs of living and energy have forced many of our citizens to seek the assistance of private charities. I am touched by the effort by our courageous citizens who donate so much of their time, energy, and resources to aid the hungry. However, the message they are sending to Washington is clear: Private charities and food banks simply do not have the resources or ability to meet the needs of the rising population of hungry Americans.

Much has been said over the past 6 years about the need to reduce the Federal deficit. I wholeheartedly agree that this is a major problem and must be addressed. However, I question the wisdom in cutting back on programs that are designed to assist the hungry. A healthy population is as essential to America as is our national defense. It seems ironic to me that so much of our resources will be placed on bombs and nuclear weaponry, while many of our children will suffer from brain damage due to malnutrition. Across the street from the White House there is a park full of the homeless and hungry who live in the streets, picking through trash for their meals, and seeking shelter in subways from the cold winter nights. This scenario occurs in every city throughout the Nation. Do we not have a responsibility to these people? Are they not our brothers and sisters? I believe that our budget priorities should incorporate the basic values of human rights, which include the right to a sound and healthy diet.

Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, World Food Day gives us an opportunity to express thankfulness again for the agricultural plenty of the United States, and to renew our resolve in the campaign against the hunger afflicting the poor populations of the world.

The continuing, long-term solution for hunger in developing countries is to raise their own agricultural production to achieve food self-reliance. To this end, America and other donors have been providing assistance for self-help programs in many countries over the years.

There has been marked success in this compaign in Asia and most other parts of the Third World. The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] 1985 World Food Report says global food and agricultural production rose by more than 4 percent in 1984 for one of the best results in the past decade. It reports production increases mainly in the United States, West Europe, and also in the larger developing countries, including China and India, were led by a stunning 8.5 percent growth in cereal output to 1,780 million tons—a new record.

The notable exception to date has been in Africa, where population has been growing at 3 percent a year but grain yields have been declining for more than a decade, causing massive malnutrition.

In short, we have done much in the anti-hunger campaign. But much remains to be done.

On this World Food Day in 1985, it seems particularly appropriate that we take encouragement over the gains—and the ameliorating of tragedies which could have been worse—over the past 12 months.

We have just been through an extraordinary and heart-rending year with the famine catastrophies of sub-Sahara Africa. A year ago at this time the attentions of affluent populations in the Western world were gripped by television scenes of starving men, women, and children in the parched highlands of Ethiopia. International experts were reporting that tens of millions of Africans were at risk of death from drought. The "gap" which needed to be filled by emergency food aid was vast and nowhere near filled by existing donor pledges. Even where emergency food shipments could be landed at ocean ports, it was feared that inland transportation bottlenecks in various places could impair distribution to some of the neediest populaces. The international community rushed to mount a massive rescue effort.

Today the experts are reporting the risk of starvation in sub-Sahara Africa is facing far fewer people than a year ago. Some officials calculate that only about one-third as many now require emergency feeding, and those are in a relatively small number of countries where emergency programs are already underway.

Indeed, from some sub-Sahara countries we are now getting reports warning against having too much emergency food aid around at harvest time—the shipments from abroad could have a price-depressing effect on produce the local farmers are trying to sell! And from much of the continent, we have word of agricultural rehabilitation that will be helped by long-term development assistance from foreign donors, rather than further emergency food aid at this time.

The FAO's latest special report on the food situation in the 21 African countries affected by emergencies speaks of improved prospects generally although exceptional food aid will continue to be needed in the 1985-86 crop year for 5 of them—Angola, Botswana, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Sudan. "Reflecting good harvests in 1985 in most of the affected countries in eastern, southern, and northern Africa and the favorable crop prospects in the Sahelian countries of West Africa, the overall food supply position for most of the 21 affected countries is expected to improve and it is back to normal in a number of them," the FAO report states.

U.S. Government analysts are currently revising significantly their assessments of last July which were issued in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's report on "World Food Needs and Availabilities, 1985." Because of improvements greater than expected, they now estimate that global food aid needs covering 69 countries will be around 9 million tons in the 1985-86 crop year, down from the 11.4 million tons they had forecast in July. For sub-Sahara Africa, they are estimating 2.7 million tons needed in the coming year, sharply less than the 4 million tons estimate in July.

As these reports show, the act of Divine Providence in returning more favorable weather to many of the afflicted countries has been the key element in the improvement.

Another major element has been the hardiness, the resourcefulness, the determination of the drought-stricken populaces themselves to survive in the face of food adversities far worse than we encounter in the West.

And credit must be given to one of the most impressive international emergency food aid efforts of recent times, which has saved untold numbers of lives.

In the 1984-85 year, donor nations shipped an estimated 11.7 million tons of cereal food aid to needy countries, the first time the 10-million-ton annual target set by the World Food Conference in 1974 was surpassed. The United States provided 7.4 million tons, 63 percent of the total. The surge in the global total was of course due to the response to the desperate situation in Africa.

The United States in fiscal 1985 shipped more than 3 million tons of food to the afflicted African countries, valued at more than $1 billion, helping to reach more than 40 million hungry people. We in the Congress ensured a massive U.S. response with passage of emergency legislation providing $812.5 million in supplemental funding.

American private and voluntary agencies have been in the vanguard of the relief effort. They merit our highest praise for their unstinting devotion to saving lives and helping rehabilitation in this emergency.

They have had enormous support from the American people. INTERACTION, the association of 105 American PVO's, has reported receiving more than $140 million in donations for African/Ethiopian relief. Funds have come from individuals, schools, churches, businesses, and other private groups. Further large amounts have come from special promotions such as Live Aid.

On this World Food Day, we know much further, sustained effort will be needed in coming years to combat hunger where it still exists around the globe. But we can look with considerable pride at what has been done so far.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be among those who today are celebrating the fifth annual World Food Day and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO]. I would like to commend Representatives LELAND, ROUKEMA, and GILMAN for their work on the issue of world hunger, and for organizing this special order.

Recently the press has been highlighting the plight of those who are hungry around the world. While the latest media attention focuses on the immediate crisis in Ethopia and other places in sub-Sahara Africa, the problems of world hunger and malnutrition are extremely complex, making long range solutions very difficult. Although crises such as droughts and civil wars exacerbate existing food shortages in various parts of the world, hundreds of millions of people around the world suffer from a chronic lack of sufficient food. The most vulnerable are women, infants, and children. While over one-fourth of the people in developing countries are suffering from malnutrition, hunger is also a problem for many here in the United States.

World Food Day is a perfect opportunity to point out the immediate need to get food to the hungry, as well as to discuss possible long range solutions to the problem of world hunger. I am pleased to say that several groups in my district are observing World Food Day through activities designed to highlight both the short-term and the long range facets of the world hunger problem.

Today in downtown Akron, OH, residents of the Akron-Canton area are loading over 200,000 pounds of edible soybean oil, nonfat dry milk, and soy-fortified corn meal for shipment to West Africa. This may be the largest privately funded mercy shipment of food sent to Africa from the United States to date. The event is being organized by a group of local citizens who call themselves ACT—Akron and Canton Together—for Africa, in cooperation with World Vision, a nonprofit international relief and development organization.

Most of the food to be shipped to Africa was grown in Ohio and purchased at less than wholesale rates. Both the manpower and the equipment for the loading of the food were donated. Transportation services were provided by various donors within the trucking industry, and other services were provided at reduced rates.

ACT for Africa was created last spring when a group of religious, civic, education, business, labor, and professional leaders in the Akron-Canton area decided to mobilize a local response to Africa's famine crisis. Led by Dan Cormany, associate dean of students at Malone College in Canton, the group has raised over $100,000 for relief efforts. In addition to collecting money and arranging the food shipments to Africa, the group has helped to educate the local residents about the long-term causes and solutions of the world hunger problem. I want to commend the members of ACT for Africa for their hard work and dedication to this effort.

Another group in my district is working to end hunger, but this time the hungry people are living in this country. The Akron Area Foodbanc serves hungry people in a five-county area of northeast Ohio. The Foodbanc provides assistance to over 150 food pantries and 12 soup kitchens in the region. In 1984, the Foodbanc served 153,670 meals to hungry people in the area, and it distributed 182,684 food baskets to needy families. The Foodbanc reports a 13-percent increase in requests for food assistance from 1983 to 1984. On World Food Day, the Akron Area Foodbanc will continue its work to feed the hungry who live in the Akron-Canton area. The many volunteers and workers in this organization also deserve our praise and support.

We must all feel a deep sadness that hunger remains a real problem both in our country and around the world. But we can be proud that thousands of people, in Ohio and elsewhere, are giving and working to end this tragic situation.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, today's observance of the fifth celebration of World Food Day and the 40th anniversary of the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization makes us pause in our daily affairs and reflect upon the increasing rate of hunger in this world and the pain and suffering, both physical and mental, resulting from not being able to eat or drink. By participating in this special order, I hope to join my colleagues in calling attention to the tragic plight of the hungry and the undernourished, here in America and abroad, particularly in Africa.

The sad but true fact is that the number of hungry Americans is still growing and increasing from day to day, month to month, year to year. The Federal food assistance programs are not meeting the food and nutrition needs of millions of Americans, and private relief organizations have been stretched to the limit. Recent studies confirm these alarming statistics. The Food Stamp Program is the Nation's primary assistance program, designed to serve entire families of low income people. In 1985, this program has served 20 million Americans at a cost of approximately $12 billion. Yet the number of people participating in the Food Stamp Program has declined at a large rate, and not simply because they have suddenly found the means to pay for their food out of their own pockets. Federal cutbacks, pride, social stigma, and lack of information are the major causes for the lack of participation in the program by those who are otherwise eligible for it. There appears to be an unwillingness on the part of those who need public assistance to seek it, and a societal disdain toward those who receive food stamps. This prevailing negative attitude toward the recipients of food stamps causes many individuals to hesitate to seek assistance, especially in small towns where the would-be recipients are well known.

For those who are eligible and want to take part in the Food Stamp Program, other barriers exist. Complex application procedures, inconvenient office hours and locations, tremendous delays in processing applications, stricter eligibility guidelines, and complicated paperwork requirements prevent some people from receiving the food stamps and cause those who are getting this assistance to lose it. Even those who manage to receive food stamps still suffer from shortages. In short, the Food Stamp Program, the country's major weapon against hunger and malnutrition, has not been improved or expanded in the past 4 years.

Other alarming trends in America point to the rising increase of hunger here. Fewer and fewer women are taking part in the supplemental feeding programs available to them, the WIC program, and fewer and fewer children are participating in the school breakfast and school lunch programs. Senior citizens and elderly Americans are not receiving the federally subsidized meals to which they are entitled. Private charities and religious organizations, seeking to make up for the cutbacks in Federal aid, are strapped and can no longer help the hungry and the undernourished as they once could. It is indeed a sad state of affairs that today in America, in the so-called land of plenty, the hungry and the ill-fed are not receiving the basic elements necessary for subsistence.

A similar story can be heard abroad, especially in Africa. We daily read about the disastrous effects of the hunger and the drought in Ethiopia, the Sudan, Chad, and other African nations. The United States alone has sent this year almost 2 billion metric tons of food to the African Continent, has contributed $10.5 million in emergency funding for African refugees, and the problems still endure, unabated. People are dying daily from starvation and thirst, children are suffering even now from dysentery and distended stomaches caused by malnutrition, and human beings are expiring simply because they have lost all hope for ever living on the basic levels of subsistence.

The command of "feeding the hungry and giving drink to the thirsty" harks back to pre-Biblical days. Every society has a moral and ethical obligation to help those who are suffering from hunger and drought, to give them aid in their time of need, and to make the maximum effort to help them to end their suffering and travail. In this country, we must redouble our measures to end world hunger, as we mark World Food Day. In that way, we may yet live to see the day when the human race will no longer be afflicted by this terrible condition and all Americans will be able to enjoy the fruits of our own society.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of necessary absence.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOORE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 10 minutes, on October 17.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OBERSTAR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUNDINE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CARPER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, on October 17.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, on October 17.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, on October 22.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, on October 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. YOUNG of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GROTBERG.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. GALLO.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. LENT in two instances.
Mr. SWINDALL.
Mr. GREEN in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. BOEHLERT.
Mr. KEMP.
Mr. LOWERY of California.
Mr. COURTER.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. EVANS of Iowa.
Ms. FIEDLER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OBERSTAR) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOSTMAYER.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
Mr. MARTINEZ in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. BIAGGI.
Mr. FUSTER.
Mr. DOWNEY of New York.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. SIKORSKI.
Mr. ECKART of Ohio.
Mr. MATSUI in two instances.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. GARCIA.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. KOLTER in two instances.
Mr. DYMALLY.
Mr. GORDON.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

S. 1349. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded in docket 363 to the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Eastern or Mississippi Sioux before the U.S. Court of Claims and Claims Court;

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution designating February 1986 as "National Community College Month"; and

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, as "National CPR Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, October 17, 1985, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2137. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report that no U.S. personnel either took part or were injured in an attack presumably upon them at La Union, El Salvador, on October 10, 1985, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761(c)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2138. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a report on compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2139. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics, U.S. Marine Corps, transmitting a report of the Retirement Plan for Civilian Employees of the U.S. Marine Corps Exchanges, etc., for the year ending December 31, 1984, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2140. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, transmitting an update of the 1983 evaluation report on the trustee pilot program for bankruptcy administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2141. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to improve the confidential disclosure system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2142. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development and First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the amount and extension of credit under the Trade Credit Insurance Program, jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

2143. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Financial Condition of American Agriculture" (GAO/RCED-86-09, October 10, 1985); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Agriculture.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GROTBERG, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.R. 3567. A bill to improve the quality of examinations of depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY of New York (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 3568. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to require regulated retail electric utilities to undertake reasonably prudent response activities when natural disasters cause interruptions in electric service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ROE, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. FLORIO):

H.R. 3569. A bill to restrict the dumping of sewage sludge in the ocean site off the coast of New York and New Jersey known as the "106-Mile Ocean Waste Dump Site" to certain authorities currently authorized to dump sewage sludge in the New York Bight Apex; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. GREEN):

H.R. 3570. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to reform and improve the Federal justices and judges survivors' annuities program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. SNYDER) (by request):

H.R. 3571. A bill to amend section 1110 of title 11, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3572. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 11, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. BONKER):

H.R. 3573. A bill to achieve stable and reasonable exchange rates for international currencies to strengthen the international economy and provide for international economic growth; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCEWEN:

H.R. 3574. A bill to require that employees of defense contractors be required to undergo a criminal history information check before performing work on military installations and to provide the Department of Defense the right to access to such information; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, and Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3575. A bill to amend chapter 51 to title 18, United States Code, to impose criminal penalties, including the death penalty, for homicide in the commission of a terrorist act outside the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWINDALL:

H.R. 3576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow deductions from gross income for contributions not in excess of $3,000 for any calendar year to an education savings account established to accumulate savings to pay the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education expenses of any individual, and for other purposes: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. DELAY):

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution designating the month of January 1986 as "United States Savings Bonds Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SILJANDER (for himself, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GROTBERG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution condemning the racism and antisemitism of Louis Farrakhan and finding his racism and divisiveness morally repugnant to the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution condemning the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* and the murder of Leon Klinghoffer and commending President Reagan and others who assisted in the apprehension of the perpetrators of such acts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H. Res. 295. Resolution urging a joint United States-Soviet effort to achieve worldwide disease immunization by 1990; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

271. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the State Assembly of California, relative to nuclear crisis control centers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

272. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the deduction for State and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. TAYLOR introduced a bill (H.R. 3577) for the relief of Milanie C. Escobal Norman and Angela Dawn Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 776: Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 864: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 887: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 999: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1017: Mr. WYLIE.

H.R. 1145: Mr. BOLAND.

H.R. 1207: Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. SHARP, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 1316: Mr. MCCAIN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1338: Mr. KINDNESS.

H.R. 1353: Mr. GROTBERG.

H.R. 1393: Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 1479: Mr. WORTLEY and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1584: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1674: Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 1769: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FROST, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1875: Mr. MANTON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 2080: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. MCCAIN.

H.R. 2205: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 2580: Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ATKINS, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2588: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. FISH, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MACK, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. COBEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. CHAPPELL.

H.R. 2659: Mr. GREGG.

H.R. 2741: Mr. SUNIA and Mr. DEWINE.

H.R. 2768: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2782: Mr. CONTE, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2833: Mr. WILLIAMS and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2834: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2863: Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2876: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BARNES, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 2943: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 2954: Mr. COBEY, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. MURPHY Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. CHAPPIE.

H.R. 3042: Mr. EDGAR and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 3059: Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 3064: Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. YATES, Mr. FISH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 3131: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DYSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3132: Mr. DURBIN Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 3147: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3190: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 3260: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BEDELL, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3263: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 3326: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3328: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. KINDNESS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

H.R. 3339: Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.R. 3344: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SABO, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 3346: Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 3357: Mr. BOULTER.

H.R. 3371: Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. KOLBE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3372: Mr. MCKINNEY and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 3420: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 3436: Mr. WOLF and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 3444: Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3448: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 3511: Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. KINDNESS.

H.R. 3512: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FROST, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 3515: Mr. DANIEL.

H.R. 3521: Mr. LEATH of Texas.

HJ. Res. 127: Mr. RODINO, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.J. Res. 245: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HATCHER, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.J. Res. 381: Mr. EDGAR.

H.J. Res. 416: Mr. PACKARD.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. MANTON.

H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. DANIEL and Mr. MONSON.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ERDREICH, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 76: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. DAUB, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H. Res. 105: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 194: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. SISISKY.

H. Res. 219: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. WEAVER.

H. Res. 245: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. FISH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OLIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H. Res. 270: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. HOYER.

H. Res. 271: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. CARNEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3520: Mr. WOLF.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3500

By Mr. UDALL:

—Page 412, line 19, through page 420, line 23, strike out sections 5101 through 5104 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5101. DISTRIBUTION OF SECTION 8(g) ACCOUNT.

(a) Any and all rights under section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)) with respect to bonuses and rents received before the date of enactment of this Act are hereby extinguished. In lieu of such rights, and in accordance with the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall, from the separate account in the United States Treasury established under section 8(g)(4), pay—

(1) $376,916,681 to the State of Texas;

(2) $492,576.427 to the State of Louisiana;

(3) $374,035,443 to the State of California;

(4) $56,255,324 to the State of Alaska;

(5) $63,932,966 to the State of Alabama;

(6) $14,910,958 to the State of Mississippi; and

(7) $27,706 to the State of Florida;

plus interest from April 1, 1985, to the date of enactment of this Act at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. All funds attributable to bonuses and rents remaining in such account after payment is made in accordance with this section shall be credited to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(b) The acceptance of payment under this section shall satisfy and release any and all claims against the United States arising under, or related to, section 8(g) of the

Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act with respect to bonuses and rents.

and renumber subsequent sections accordingly, and

Page 427, line 17 through page 437, line 7, strike out all of sections 6401 through 6406 and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

H.R. 3327

By Mr. BROWN of California:

—Page 3, line 17, insert ": *Provided further*, That none of such funds may be used for anti-satellite system facilities at Langley Air Force Base" after "therefor".

—Page 3, line 9, strike out "$1,600,040,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,585,140,000".