



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1995

No. 149

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, September 25, 1995, at 12 noon.

## Senate

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1995

(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 5, 1995)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

O Gracious God, Sovereign of our land and source of courage, we thank You that You know our needs before we ask for Your help, but You have ordained that in the asking we would find release from the anxiety of carrying the burdens of leadership on our own shoulders. Help us to remember that You are the instigator of prayer. It begins with You, moves into our hearts, gives us the clarity of knowing how to pray, and then returns to You in petitions that You have refined and guided us to ask. We are astonished that You have chosen to do Your work through us and to use prayer to reorient our minds around Your guidance for the issues we will face today. We say with the psalmist, "You are my rock and my fortress; therefore, for Your name's sake, lead me and guide me."—Psalm 31:3. Suddenly, we see prayer in a whole new perspective. It is the method by which You brief us on Your plans and bless us with Your power. May this whole day be filled with magnificent moments of turning to You for Your purposes, Your glory, and honor in America. May we receive a dynamic vision to be that quality of leaders. In the all-powerful name of our Lord. Amen.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators this morning, the Senate will begin the consideration of the conference report accompanying the military construction bill under a 50-minute time limit. This is to advise Senators that the vote will come around 10:30 this morning. And then after that, we will go to the D.C. appropriations bill during today's session, so rollcall votes can be expected throughout the session in order to complete action on these items today.

### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1817, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to

recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 14, 1995.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, there will be 20 minutes of debate equally divided between the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], or their designees. There will be 10 minutes under the control of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], and there will be 20 minutes under the control of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN].

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate the conference report on military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

The conference report is within the 602(b) budget allocation for both budget authority and outlays. I would like to mention just briefly some of the provisions in this conference agreement.

First, the conferees agreed with the Senate and approved \$3.9 billion for the implementation of the base realignment and closure decisions. This amount includes \$785 million for the 1995 round. There is also \$457 million for environmental cleanup of these facilities. It has been a difficult year for all of us in this area, and I am hopeful that these funds will relieve some of

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 14107

the burden that has affected the communities and what they are experiencing with these base closings.

Mr. President, 38 percent of our bill is for family housing. We have included Secretary Perry's initiative for a new family housing program. We are hopeful that this will start to relieve some of the burden in keeping adequate housing for our service people.

With regard to the barracks and dormitories, we provided \$675 million. We are hopeful that the Department will soon begin another program to provide alternative methods of housing our service members. We cannot afford to continue to build brandnew barracks when we still have people living in open bays.

The conferees did agree to earmark 430 million dollars' worth of funds for the National Guard and Reserve. The Department continues to ignore the needs of our citizen soldiers, and we will not ignore them, because we are keenly aware of the vital role they play in the defense of this country.

We did not fund any armories this year. This has been a difficult decision. However, we want the National Guard to take a hard look at where we are going with armories. There are about 3,000 armories in the United States, and we cannot keep adding new ones. In these austere times, the overhead has become too much of a burden.

This is the first year for me on this subcommittee, and I look forward to the process next year. We have just begun to change on how we build and maintain our facilities for the military.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada, with whom I have worked closely on this bill, and the conferees in the House, because I think we have come through with a bill that is fair and balanced. We have kept everybody informed exactly on what we have been doing, and we have also taken a look at what the administration wants to do and some of the needs that might have been overlooked by the administration.

So I yield the floor to my friend, the ranking minority member, the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at this time, I ask Senator BINGAMAN to go ahead and use his 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the chance to speak on this legislation. I wish to speak in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1817, which is the fiscal year 1996 Military Construction Appropriations Act.

I opposed the bill when the Senate debated it in July, and now the conferees, in my view, have brought back an even worse bill with even more additions for Member interest projects.

We hear much these days about the need for deficit reduction. Critical domestic programs, such as education and health care and energy assistance

for the poor and civilian research are being decimated by the Republican Congress on the grounds that we absolutely must fulfill the electorate's mandate to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Committees throughout the Congress are busily reporting their contributions to the reconciliation bill and including provisions that, in my view, will do major damage to our Nation's health and future prosperity.

We have already debated some appropriations bills that make major reductions in critical programs, such as Indian education and health. We will soon be debating others which decimate domestic programs in housing, education, and many other areas.

While these domestic programs are being cut to the bone, we have before us now a conference report that includes 129 Member interest projects not requested by the Pentagon.

The projects, totaling \$795 million, are spread among 45 States—all except Connecticut, Maine, Delaware, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Texas tops the list with nine add-on projects, totaling \$47 million. Kansas has five projects worth \$33.5 million and, accordingly, is another big winner.

Mr. President, this bill makes a mockery of all the protestations about deficit reduction coming from this Congress and leading Republican candidates. In my view, the President should veto this bill. The President was not stingy in his request for funding for military construction projects. His fiscal year 1996 military construction budget proposed a 22-percent increase; that is nearly a \$2 billion increase above the 1995 level. He put particular emphasis on the needs for family housing and implementation of base closure and realignment recommendations.

What this Congress is now proposing to send to the President is a pork-laden bill with a net addition of \$479 million above the President's budget request. Essentially, this so-called fiscally conservative Congress is saying that a 22-percent increase in military construction is not enough, that the increase needs to be 28 percent.

Mr. President, where else are we saying that this year? Outside of the defense budget, is there a single major discretionary or mandatory spending category that is growing 27 percent? I cannot think of a single one. I can think of a lot that are being cut at least 28 percent. In reality, the increase is even larger because many of the so-called cuts made in the bill are phony. They will just pay the bills in future years. A few large projects are stretched out so that we can defer paying the total bill until some future fiscal year. For example, \$92 million is postponed from the third phase of a project in the Army Institute of Research in Maryland out of \$119 million requested.

I could give other examples. Unfortunately, this bill has sailed through both Houses with bipartisan support.

There is so much money available to spend in this area that there has been plenty to allocate to interest items on the Democratic as well as the Republican side. When Senators MCCAIN, KERREY, and I attempted on July 21 to trim \$300 million out of the Senate version of the bill that had at the time about 100 unrequested projects, we were defeated 77 to 18. That vote occurred minutes after the Senate had given final approval to the \$16 billion in rescissions in domestic programs for fiscal year 1995.

The President has not condoned business as usual on this bill in the Congress. Throughout the budget process, the administration has expressed strong objections to the hundreds of millions of dollars in unrequested military construction projects. OMB Director Alice Rivlin told Senate Appropriations Chairman HATFIELD on July 18 that "with the Nation facing serious budget constraints, such a spending increase is not affordable."

The American people are not clamoring for additional spending for the Pentagon. What little support there is for increased Pentagon spending, in my view, will dwindle further when the public realizes how the additional funds would be spent by the Congress.

Mr. President, I hope that President Clinton will not associate himself with this bill. He should use his bully pulpit to explain to the American people that there are better uses for this money, including deficit reduction and education and health.

The American people want a strong defense. They also want a brighter future for their children through investments in education and research. They want a society that does not turn its back on those least able to fend for themselves. Our defense is not strengthened by squandering money on projects that the Pentagon has not requested. If Congress insists on doing so, the American people should hold us accountable for these misplaced priorities.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to set aside the narrow parochial interests and to resist the temptation of the easy press release about how good this bill is for bases in their home State, and to cast a vote against this conference report in the national interest.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from New Mexico have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has 3 minutes, 20 seconds.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator allow that time to be used by Senator GLENN?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am pleased to yield that time to Senator GLENN.

Mr. GLENN. I appreciate that. Mr. President, I will be brief today.

Mr. President, I rise today to raise my concerns over the pending fiscal year 1996 military construction conference report.

The conference agreement provides a total of \$11.2 billion in funding which is

\$480 million more than the budget request; \$775 million of that amount is for military construction projects for which the Pentagon made no request.

I have mixed feelings about this conference report, Mr. President. I strongly disagree with the practice Congress has developed over the years, with the tacit assent of the Pentagon, that results in \$770 million in unrequested projects being included in the bill.

Members are expected to get military construction projects added to each year's bill in order to demonstrate that he or she can bring home the bacon. This, in part, results from the Pentagon's recurring failure to adequately fund Guard and Reserve construction requirements. The Pentagon does not request these projects but, instead, expects Congress to add these projects to the budget.

The result is a skewing of priorities, in my opinion, Mr. President. Rather than informing Congress of what is really needed, projects are funded based on a given member's ability to get the funding included in the authorization and appropriations bills. The Senator from Arizona and I contacted Secretary Perry earlier this year to express our concern over this practice and asked that the Guard and Reserve requirements be included in the budget request.

As I mentioned, I have mixed feelings about this year's conference report because, even though we are still engaging in the practice of adding close to a billion dollars in projects, on the Senate side, we have adopted a set of criteria by which to measure add-on requests. I have worked on those criteria over the years with the chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, the Senator from Arizona. And, I am pleased that the appropriators followed those criteria this year as well.

I do not think it is too much to ask, Mr. President, that a military construction project meet certain minimum standards like being a valid military requirement, being in the service's 5-year program or having the project be sufficiently designed to be able to begin the project in the year in which it is authorized and appropriated. Quite frankly, if a project does not meet these criteria, we should not be including it as a military construction project.

Unfortunately, there are projects in this conference report that do not meet the standards we have set. I understand that these projects came over in conference from the House, but there are several that are not included in the 5-year plan and there is one that the Army simply does not want. I hope we can continue our efforts to clean up the add-on process so that we do not end up with these kinds of projects being funded in the future.

I will add that I think we are making enormous progress in this area. We used to have sheets and sheets of these things that came over. Almost every member on the committees over there,

and also here, wanted something put in to sweeten the pot to show back home that they made a special effort. This year we are down to very few—practically none in the Senate, and about a dozen or so, or 15 or 20 from over in the House.

There are several important positive things about the conference report that are worthy of support. The BRAC accounts are fully funded—these projects are important so that we can get closed back into productive use. Secretary Perry's housing initiative is fully funded—we are hopeful that this new approach will work to leverage limited funds to get new housing for our troops and their families. And, there is a considerable number of barracks, family housing projects, health care centers, and child care centers that will add to service members' quality of life.

All in all, I can support this conference report, Mr. President, but I felt compelled to outline my concerns on the add-on issue. I would hope next year we can see, for the first time, no add-ons that do not meet the criteria.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCAIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. BURNS. Will the Senator yield so I can propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCAIN. Yes.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, first of all, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur at 10:20 this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Ohio for all his efforts on behalf of bringing about a rational and reasonable process in allocating scarce taxpayer dollars for military construction projects. I also agree with my friend from Ohio that we have made significant progress. There has been a dramatic decrease in the numbers of MilCon properties that have been added—if I might say bluntly, pork barrel projects—over the years.

I say to my friend from Ohio, we have a long way to go. There are in this bill 21 projects that came from the House of Representatives that had no—no—relation to any national security requirement, was not on any person's list, was not any requirement by the Defense Department and simply was added on because it clearly related to members of the committee of oversight.

Let me also point out there is one here on the Senate side which jumps out to me. It is from the State of West Virginia.

Now, there is no rationale for that project. There is no rationale for the 21 that are from the House. There is also

a distortion in the process which Senator GLENN and I are working on with the Secretary of Defense, and that is that when we take from the future years defense plan MilCon projects we are given a list of several thousand projects that would be proposed over the next 5 or 6 years.

What Senator GLENN and I are proposing to Secretary of Defense Perry is that now the Department of Defense prioritize their list 1 through 2,000 or 10,000 or whatever it is, so when we pick additional projects—and Mr. President, I deeply regret the reality there will be additional add-ons which I will talk about, whether we should be adding on money for military construction projects or other priorities as articulated by the Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States, and all of the Joint Chiefs—when we do have add-ons, at least there will be a priority list.

Now, some of these additions that meet the criteria that Senator GLENN and I were working on come from projects that were not planned by the Pentagon until the year 2001. That is not appropriate, either, I say to my dear friend from Ohio. We have to narrow this down and make it a lot better.

Again, I appreciate the fact that Senator GLENN and I have been able to work on this issue in a bipartisan fashion now for some 8 years. I do believe that we are making some progress.

I do not mean my remarks to be critical about the hard work of the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member from Nevada. I believe that they have done a very dedicated job and I appreciate their efforts.

I point out that there are \$706 million of add-ons in this bill, \$480 million above the President's request and there are 110 new projects.

Mr. President, I wrote a letter on August 9 to the four military service chiefs and I asked them to comment on their priorities for add-ons. I want to talk about this because I hear from people who support these additional projects. "Well, we are doing this for the good of the men and women of the military. We have to improve their lifestyle. We have to make sure that their living conditions are better," et cetera, et cetera. No one is more dedicated to that proposition than the service chiefs.

The service chief priorities, all four I wrote to, with the exception of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said their priorities are different than those of the members of the Military Constructions Appropriations Subcommittee.

Admiral Boorda said, " \* \* \* there is no issue more important to Navy than our long-term shipbuilding and TACAIR procurement requirements."

General Krulak, "My first program priority is for those initiatives, both ground and air, that will enable us to out-manuever and out-shoot our opponents on tomorrow's battlefield."

General Fogleman, "At the top of the list are \* \* \* F-22, \* \* \* strategic airlift, \* \* \* additional six F-15E's and six F-16 block 50 aircraft \* \* \*"

On and on and on. I got the same response from the Secretary of Defense.

So, we should not be a little deceived at our zeal for the betterment of the men and women in the military. All of us share that commitment and desire. But the fact is that this is not in keeping with the priorities of the service chiefs and the Secretary of Defense.

Since 1990, we have had \$5 billion—billion, Mr. President—add-ons which are not requested by the Secretary of Defense for military construction projects.

Now, we have done some good things. There is a new effort at better housing conditions for the men and women in the military, and military families.

In the Readiness Subcommittee and in the Personnel Subcommittee we worked very hard on seeing that initiative move forward. We took a step forward on improvement of barracks. That is the rational way to do it.

It is not rational, Mr. President, to add 21 projects which have no requirement whatever by the Department of Defense. Hypervelocity ballistic range facility at Redstone Arsenal, AL; a fire station at Grissom Air Force Reserve Base in Indiana; electrical system upgrade at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ; Stallion Range Center water development project at White Sands Missile Range; infantry platoon battle course and antiarmor tracking and live-fire range at Fort Drum, NY; Coscom health center and SOF barracks at Fort Bragg.

Notice, Mr. President, most of the 21 add-ons that came from the other body have nothing to do with quality of life. There are some, but most of them in my view are simply pork barrel projects.

A foundry renovation at Philadelphia Naval Shipyard; modified record-fire range at Tullahoma Training Site in Tennessee; dining facility at Fort Bliss; a highway overpass at Fort Sam Houston; a BEQ expansion in Corpus Christi; small craft berthing pier at Ingleside; dormitory at Fairchild Air Force Base, WA; family housing at several other places.

Mr. President, I think it is important to point out 37 States are represented on the Defense Committee or 74 percent of the total States. Mr. President, 34 of these States got add-ons in this bill, 84 projects totaling \$537 million, representing 75 percent of the total adds that were awarded to those 34 States. Mr. President, I do not think it is coincidence.

Mr. President, General Shalikhvili, responding to questions from the Armed Services Committee was clear and unequivocal in his prioritization of additional funding, did not mention military construction. He said:

Contingency funding is at the top of the list for any additional funding provided by Congress. . . priorities for additional 1996 funding would include the accelerate of

warfighting enhancements identified in the Bottom-Up Review. . . other priorities would include funding critical modernization and procurement requirements that have slipped in the future year's defense plan.

None of the service chiefs or the Chairman cited any specific military construction projects as a high priority for additional funding.

Now when we stand up here and talk about how this bill is for the betterment of the men and women in the military, I repeat, the service chiefs and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense have the same zeal and dedication to their betterment.

They also know that they have to have the weapons with which to fight and die. General Mundy, before my subcommittee, stated he wanted the wife of a marine officer or enlisted person to be living in a very decent house but he did not want that person to be living in a decent house when the chaplain came to tell her that her husband was killed because he did not have the proper war-fighting equipment with which to save his life.

I think that is as important a statement as I have ever heard and encapsulates my opposition to the \$5 billion we have added since 1990 in unneeded and unwanted military construction add-ons.

Last year, the Congress added over \$1 billion for specific unrequested military construction projects, and I believe this bill is too high, but it is only two-thirds of that amount, and I believe that is progress of a sort.

I want to talk a moment about two projects which demonstrate the illogic of the decisions of funding add-ons. One is an add-on of \$6 million for renovating a foundry at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. The funds are used to bring the facility up to occupational standards to be utilized by the Navy at some point in the future.

This project was not requested by the Navy, nor was it included in the Navy's long-term funding plan. It does not meet the Senate's criteria, and not included in the Senate's version of the bill, but it survived in the conference agreement. I do not understand why this project was chosen as a high-priority military requirement by the conferees.

The other probability that I want to talk about is the addition of \$10 million for the Barstow-Daggett Airport facility. This project was not requested. In fact, it was specifically rejected by the Army in a letter dated September 12 in which the Secretary of the Army stated that the project was not necessary because of better, cheaper and more readily available facilities at Edwards Air Force Base, yet the House added \$10 million for the projects for the conferees and the conferees included in their agreement.

Let me note that I do not intend to include this project in the military construction authorization conference report and I believe Secretary Perry

should include both of these projects in his list of rescissions of low-priority military construction projects.

Mr. President, I want to tell the chairman and the manager of the bill and the distinguished minority member, the Senator from Nevada, I intend to send a letter to the Secretary of Defense and the President seeking for him to submit to Congress a list of rescissions. I hope we will have passed that line-item veto legislation by then so that the President could simply line-item veto it.

Mr. President, I cannot point solely to the Appropriations Committee for continuing the egregious practice of adding funding for unrequested military construction projects.

With the addition of \$7 billion to the overall defense budget request, I must admit that the Armed Services Committee was not able to resist the temptation to fund Members' special interest projects. One authorization conference report will likely authorize most of the added projects in this bill, even over my objection.

The American people sent a message to Congress last year that things in Washington had to change, but unfortunately this bill shows just how much they have not changed.

I mentioned already the amounts of money. Mr. President, 37 States are represented on either or both the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, and 34 of those States got projects. Mr. President, 84 State projects totaling \$503.7 million, or 75 percent of the total add-ons, are awarded to those 68 percent of the States which are represented on the committee. The list goes on and on. The bottom line is 86 percent of the States receiving add-ons in this bill are represented in the committee.

It seems to me there is a shift occurring, and I am glad to see some of it happening, though. The \$700 million added for unrequested projects as well as more than \$5 billion added over the past 5 years were added directly for high priority programs supported by the armed services.

As I noted before, the services need money for modernization, readiness, and other valid military requirements, not for military construction projects selected by Members of Congress. I recognize the futility of expecting Congress to stop adding money for military construction projects, but I think it is time to make those allocations based on the military services' priorities rather than location.

This year is the first year, as Senator GLENN pointed out, the Senate used, or was supposed to use, the evaluation criteria for Member add-ons which were adopted last year in the 1995 Defense Authorization Act. These criteria were set forth in a sense-of-the-Senate provision, and were designed to allow the Senate to evaluate Members' requests for additional military construction projects. Now that we have completed most of the review cycle, I

discovered an oversight in the criteria, which I mentioned before, and we need to correct that. I hope we can correct it soon.

I intend to add to the established criteria a requirement that requests for add-ons be screened for priority against the relevant services' unfunded military construction priorities. In this way, the highest priorities can be funded first.

Another serious concern I have about this bill concerns the inclusion of projects which do not meet the criteria of last year, and I have already discussed that.

We still have a long way to go in the fight to eliminate pork barrel spending from the military construction bill in both the authorizing and appropriating cycles. The good news is that the total amount of military construction additions this year will be only two-thirds of the \$1 billion added last year. In just 1 year, that is progress.

The bad news is that when additional funds are available for Defense, it is difficult to argue successfully that none of these additional funds should be spent for military construction projects. My colleagues should also consider that it will be even more difficult next year to provide additional funding for Defense. Balancing the budget has become the most urgent priority facing the country.

Another consideration of which my colleagues should become aware is the potential of a veto of the 1996 Defense appropriations bill. The President has threatened a veto in large part because of the additional \$7 billion added to Defense. If the Defense bill is vetoed, Congress may be forced to cut back on some of the added spending in that bill, spending which was allocated principally to the modernization program so important to our military service chiefs.

The question I put to my colleagues is: What share of any reduction in defense spending will be allocated to military construction? That may be a very important question.

The conference report in some ways represents a significant improvement, but I believe we have a long way to go. I am glad to see the conferees did not add funding for any projects which were not included in either the House or the Senate versions of the bill. Of that I am deeply appreciative. There are many other laudable provisions in the bill, particularly the new family housing initiative which will, I believe, begin to solve the daunting problem of undertaking a massive overhaul of military housing across the Nation.

I want to summarize by saying, in case some of my colleagues have not recognized it, defense spending overall has come under intense scrutiny and intense criticism throughout America. Many Americans do not understand why we are spending as much money as we are on defense in light of the fact that the cold war is over. They do not understand why we are purchasing

post-cold-war relics such as the B-2 bomber and *Seawolf* submarine. They certainly do not understand why we add on military construction projects which have no relevance to national security requirements.

The problem that we are facing, all of us, is maintaining the confidence of the American people that their tax dollars which are earmarked for defense are being spent wisely. If we continue to fund unneeded and unwanted projects, we will see further cuts in defense, which in my view will endanger our ability to defend this Nation's vital national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to take that into consideration as they consider projects which are relevant only to their home State or district.

I reserve the remainder of my time. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Montana have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 5 minutes. The Senator from Nevada has 10 minutes. And the Senator from Arizona has 3 minutes left.

Mr. REID. How much time does the distinguished President pro tempore require?

Mr. THURMOND. About 4 minutes. Mr. REID. I will yield him 2 minutes of my time and the Senator from Montana will yield 2 minutes of his time.

Mr. BURNS. That will be good. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to compliment Senator BURNS and Senator REID for their leadership in arriving at this conference. This military construction bill mirrors the construction priorities and criteria for projects established by the Armed Services Committee. I am particularly pleased by the emphasis placed on projects that will enhance the quality of life of the men and women in our military and on projects which will enhance the readiness of our Armed Forces. The bill also fully funds the base closure account request and provides the necessary funds to support environmental compliance projects. Both are areas which have historically been used as sources of funds for other projects.

Mr. President, I believe overall this is a good conference report, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Although I urge the adoption of this conference report, I do not favor every item in it. If I had my way, I would have eliminated some of the add-ons, and other parts of the report. But this Appropriations Committee—and I am not a member of that committee—has studied this matter well. They have come up with this report. It is not perfect. No report is perfect. No report pleases everybody. But as a whole, this report will provide for the needs of the Defense Department and the men and women of our Armed Forces. I think it

is important to our Nation and to our defense.

I urge the Senate to adopt the report. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator BURNS from Montana, in presenting this conference report on military construction for the next fiscal year. I also want to extend my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the President pro tempore of the Senate, for his statement in support of this conference report.

There is no one in the Senate who has more authority, more experience, and more ability in speaking about military readiness of this country than the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. It means a lot to the two managers of this bill to have him on the floor supporting this conference report.

This conference report fulfills an obligation to fund downsizing of our extensive military overhead, extensive basing system, and fully funds the implementation of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. That is a sizable chunk of this bill, almost \$4 billion. More than a third of the dollars appropriated in this measure go to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission.

So the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Nevada really were in an uphill battle in arriving at the conference report we did, when we start out using approximately one-third of the dollars appropriated for base closing and realignment.

There are two other aspects of the bill which merit the Senate's attention. It goes a long way to getting our hands around the long-neglected problem of housing for our military families and for our single soldiers. Housing has always taken a back seat to more urgent near-term military requirements.

But it is the feeling of the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Montana that housing is an important element of maintaining a safe, secure, and contented military.

This year, as the distinguished chairman has pointed out, some 38 percent of the bill is for housing. The new initiative by Secretary for private sector participation in new housing is included in the bill. Indeed, the committee has included about \$179 million above the President's request for this housing. All of it, and more if we could afford it, is needed to bridge the gap that must be overcome in order to be able to maintain a high quality All-Volunteer Force in the years ahead. The request by the administration could have been higher, and I will give you an example. There were zero dollars in the request for whole barracks

renewal at one major western Army facility.

It is in Hawaii. The structures are some 50 years or more old. They have had it. The conference committee wisely included \$30 million for this project, money which was in the 5-year defense program, but only in future years. When we asked the Army why the barracks had no funding at all in fiscal year 1996, there was no coherent answer. So the subcommittee took what I think was a prudent step in beginning this project. This is but one example of actions which we took that put our final bill above the budget request by about \$480 million over the President's request.

Mr. President, a similar story can be told for the funding of the Reserve and Guard Forces of our country.

Mr. President, it is traditional that the Pentagon never asks for money for the Guard and Reserve. I repeat: It is traditional. When we have this bill before us, we have an obligation to our Guard and Reserve Forces to fund them. It really is unfair what this administration has done and past administrations have done in funding the Guard and Reserve.

If we are going to continue to be ready to deploy and fight in the Persian Gulf, or Korea, or elsewhere, and reduce the size of our Active Forces, we must maintain robust Reserve and Guard Forces. Unfortunately, the administration followed past practice this year and seriously underfunded these accounts.

I cannot understand why this administration and past administrations ignore the Guard and Reserve. I do not understand. Well, I do. They do it because they know that we are going to take care of it. And I say this, Mr. President, we are going to continue, as long as I am part of this committee, to try to take care of our Guard and Reserve Forces regardless of how the administration ignores them, because it is an important and it is becoming a more important part of the national security of this country.

Consider these figures—in fiscal year 1995 the Congress appropriated \$574 million for the Reserves and Guard, while for fiscal year 1996 the administration requested only \$182 million.

They did not even ask for a third of what was given last year to the Guard and Reserve.

So the committee had little choice but to dramatically increase the funding for projects in these accounts not requested for fiscal year 1995, and appropriated some \$430 million. So on the one hand we ended up some 25 percent below fiscal year 1995, we were still \$248 million above the President's request. If we had just met the President's request, we would soon have a Reserve Force not ready to fight. That is clearly the case.

Mr. President, the administration wrote to me and the chairman, providing its views on the bills passed by each Chamber and before we went to conference.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT  
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 14, 1995.

Hon. HARRY REID,

Subcommittee on Military Construction Appropriations,  
Committee on Appropriations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: The purpose of this letter is to provide the Administration's views on H.R. 1817, the Military Construction Appropriations Bill, FY 1996, as passed by the House and by the Senate. As you develop the conference version of the bill, your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The Administration is committed to balancing the Federal budget by FY 2005. The President's budget proposes to reduce discretionary spending for FY 1996 by \$5 billion in outlays below the FY 1995 enacted level. The Administration does not support the level of funding assumed by the House or Senate Committee 602(b) allocations. The Administration must evaluate each bill both in terms of funding levels provided and the share of total resources available for remaining priorities. Both the House and Senate versions of this bill exceed the President's request by over \$450 million.

The Administration has recognized the need for significant funding increases for military construction programs by proposing an overall increase of 22 percent over the FY 1995 enacted level. However, the Administration believes that further increases, as provided by both the House and the Senate, are unwarranted, particularly when other legislation is drastically cutting programs that are vitally important to a higher standard of living for all Americans. Because the Administration has serious concerns about the overall priorities reflected in the appropriations process, we believe that it is essential to reduce the total funding level provided in this bill.

#### FUNDING PRIORITIES

The Administration appreciates the support of the House and Senate for funding the request for the base realignment and closure program, the family housing program, and requested construction projects. The Administration particularly appreciates the approval of funding for the family housing improvement program. The funding provided will enable the Department of Defense to improve the quality of life of our military members.

The Administration notes, however, that both the House and the Senate have provided approximately \$650 million in funding for unrequested construction projects. Many of these projects are funded at the expense of high-priority requested projects, and a number of these unrequested projects are not included in the Defense Department's long-range plan. The Administration strongly urges the conferees to eliminate unrequested funding for low-priority programs.

#### OVERSEAS CONSTRUCTION

The House version of the bill provides \$65 million, as requested, for high-priority repositioning projects at classified locations overseas. The Senate has recommended eliminating funding for these projects. Failure to pursue these projects would increase military response time to areas of particular importance to the U.S. and discourage further cooperation by affected countries. Repositioning on land is a cost-effective way to permit our armed forces to react to

threats quickly and with the necessary military capability. The conferees are urged to adopt the House position and to provide the funding requested for these projects.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP

The Administration objects to the House and Senate language that would limit funding for environmental cleanup at base realignment and closure sites. The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) accounts were created with a great deal of flexibility to permit DOD to allocate BRAC funds to the programs and locations with the greatest need at the moment. Constraining DOD's ability to apply BRAC funds to environmental cleanup could, if estimated requirements change, delay the transfer of base property to local redevelopment authorities, worsening the economic impact on the affected communities. The Administration urges the conferees to uphold the flexibility of the BRAC accounts and to support the affected communities by removing these artificial ceilings.

#### CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION

The House version of the bill provides \$95 million, as requested, for continued construction of two chemical demilitarization facilities at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and Umatilla, Oregon. The Senate has recommended eliminating funding for these two projects in the belief that unobligated appropriations for construction of a chemical demilitarization facility at Anniston, Alabama, would be available for the projects. Contract award for the Anniston facility, however, is scheduled during FY 1996. To help maintain the construction schedule and prevent cost increases in the chemical demilitarization program, the conferees are urged to adopt the House position and to provide the funding requested for these two facilities.

The Administration believes that the suggested changes discussed above would result in a fiscally responsible bill that funds programs of national significance. We look forward to working with the conferees to address our mutual concerns.

Sincerely,

Alice M. Rivlin,  
Director.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the conference committee did make the serious effort to accommodate the administration on a number of items. We added some \$65 million for an overseas construction item, in the Middle East, which the Senate had zeroed out in order to give the administration some incentive to secure matching funds of some kind from the recipient country.

We did not get those matching funds. But we acceded to the President's request, and the request of the House, and met that \$65 million figure in conference. Such funds have not been secured, but we acceded to the administration's request in any event. Second, the administration asked to be relieved of a statutory ceiling on the amounts to be appropriated for environmental cleanup in the BRAC process. Here too we completely acceded to that request in the conference. Third, the administration wanted to reinstate funding for chemical demilitarization facilities which the Senate eliminated. In this case, the conference included planning and design funds for the projects. So I think it is fair to say we made a good faith effort to meet the administration's objections to the Senate bill.

I say to the administration that they are making a mistake even thinking about vetoing this bill. This bill passed the House 326 to 98. It does not take much math to understand that is not very good material for vetoing. I believe this bill will pass the Senate by the same large margins because it is a good bill. It meets the problems of this country.

Therefore, I think the administration should look hard and sympathetically at the committee's efforts to adequately fund the Guard and Reserve, and to adequately fund our housing needs in considering whether there was arguable justification for going above the President's request in its final appropriations recommendation. Nearly all the additional funds the committee added above the President's budget were dedicated to quality-of-life housing and Guard and Reserve projects. Therefore I strongly encourage the President to sign this bill and join with us in attacking the problems which the committee recognized as important to our Nation's national security.

Mr. President, every project in this bill is for the national security of this country. I believe if we look at the Guard and Reserve—and we had a caucus on the Guard and Reserve which was bipartisan and chaired by Senator BOND and cochaired by Senator FORD. They support this legislation.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. It is a bill that meets the demands of our national security interests.

I would like to say it has been a pleasure to work closely with the distinguished chairman on this measure. We have had an open, bipartisan approach to the problems of base closure, family housing, Reserve and Guard forces, and the other matters in this bill. It could have been a difficult conference. I think the work we did in pre-conferencing made it a relatively easy conference. We have not had any significant disagreements.

I thank the chairman for his support and for the chairman's staff director, Jim Morhard, and his assistant, Warren Johnson, as well as Dick D'Amato assigned to me by the full committee leadership. I also appreciate the work of B.G. Wright, a congressional fellow working on this bill, and also Peter Arapis of my staff.

Mr. President, this legislation could never have been accomplished without the leadership of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mr. HATFIELD, and the ranking member, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD. I extend to them also my appreciation.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, for his comments, because all of these issues were talked about in the Armed Services Committee and have been authorized by that committee.

Mr. President, the ranking member, the Senator from Nevada, is exactly

right on target. We worked very hard on this because we took a look at the inventory of housing that we had for our armed services. We found that half of that housing was substandard. It would not even be qualified to be inhabited under today's standards.

We have taken a giant step toward this with this piece of legislation. So I appreciate his cooperation and enjoyed working with Senator REID on this.

I appreciate the work of Dick D'Amato and his staff, and also Jim Morhard and Julie Lapeyre, who worked hard to make this a very good bill and a balanced bill.

GULFPORT AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, would the distinguished chairman and manager of the bill yield for a clarification?

Mr. BURNS. I would be pleased to yield to the assistant majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. I thank my friend from Montana. I note that the conference report includes funding for a road relocation project at the Gulfport Air National Guard base in Gulfport, MS. The funding level associated with this project in the conference report is half the amount required for the entire project.

The conference report, however, does not note that the funding provided for this important project is only half the total required. Is my understanding correct that the funds provided for this project in the conference report is specifically designated for phase 1 of this effort—and that next year phase 2 of this project will be addressed?

Mr. BURNS. I appreciate my friend from Mississippi raising this issue and I am pleased to clarify the scope of this project. The funds provided in this conference report for the road relocation project in Gulfport, MS, are intended to pay the first half of the cost for the total road relocation effort. This phase 1 effort is intended to begin the job of relocating the road. It is my hope that the second phase of this funding effort will be in the 1997 military construction appropriations request.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if I could join my colleague, Senator LOTT, in this discussion, I would like to add that the full amount of the project was included in the Senate reported military construction appropriations bill. I know very well the difficult negotiations required to move this appropriation bill through the conference committee. I know that great effort was made to secure this funding for the road relocation project and I appreciate his diligence on this issue.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this phase 1 funding will allow the Department of Defense to initiate actions, contractual or otherwise, to start this project in fiscal year 1996?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, the conference committee's decision to include funding for phase 1 of this project was intended to initiate actions to execute this project in fiscal year 1996, including contract award and initial con-

struction. I would note that the project is in the Senate defense authorization bill currently in conference, and under the authority which will be provided by the adoption of that conference bill, the Department should proceed in due course to execute all actions required to perform this work. We hope to pay for this work in two phases—not just one.

Mr. LOTT. I appreciate the attention of the chairman to this important project, as well as the invaluable assistance of my colleague from Mississippi, Senator COCHRAN.

Mr. COCHRAN. I join Senator LOTT in expressing appreciation to the chairman for his diligent efforts on this issue and many others in this important bill. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering the conference agreement accompanying H.R. 1817, the fiscal year 1996 military construction appropriations bill.

The bill provides a total of \$11.2 billion in budget authority and \$3.1 billion in new outlays for the military construction and family housing programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996.

When outlays from prior year budget authority and other completed actions are taken into account, the bill totals \$11.2 billion in budget authority and \$9.6 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1996.

Mr. President, the bill provides for readiness and quality of life programs for our service men and women. The bill is at the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation in budget authority and the bill is below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation in outlays.

I wish to convey my thanks to the committee for the support given to several priority projects in New Mexico, including a learning center at Holloman Air Force Base.

I commend the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Montana, for his efforts on this bill.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Budget Committee table showing the final scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SUBCOMMITTEE		
[Spending totals—Conference report (fiscal year 1996, in million of dollars)]		
Category	Budget authority	Outlays
Defense discretionary:		
Outlays from prior-year BA and other actions completed .....		6,486
H.R. 1817, conference report .....	11,177	3,110
Scorekeeping adjustment .....		
Adjusted bill total .....	11,177	9,597
Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary .....	11,178	9,693
Adjusted bill total compared to Senate Subcommittee 602(b) allocation:		
Defense discretionary .....	-1	-96

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with current scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in

the RECORD a communication to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, the Committee on Appropriations, the Honorable CONRAD BURNS, signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, explaining the need for housing at Sugar Grove, WV.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, DC, September 21, 1995.

HON. CONRAD BURNS,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in response to your inquiry regarding the requirement for family housing at NSGA Sugar Grove, WV.

As you are aware, adequate housing is the top quality of life issue the Navy faces today. We currently have a deficit of 44 housing units at NSGA Sugar Grove. The remote location of this base makes it extremely difficult for the private sector to accommodate the housing needs of Navy personnel. The project added to this year's military construction appropriations bill will meet approximately half of our need.

With a total family housing deficit of 14,700 we were unable to program this project within the resources available. While this does not diminish the need for these units, they were not included in the President's budget.

I trust this answers your question. As always, if I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. PIRIE, Jr.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I know of no other debate on this piece of legislation. I urge passage of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 459 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Abraham	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Akaka	Exon	Leahy
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Levin
Bennett	Ford	Lieberman
Biden	Frist	Lott
Bond	Glenn	Lugar
Boxer	Gorton	Mack
Breaux	Graham	McConnell
Bryan	Gramm	Mikulski
Bumpers	Grams	Moynihan
Burns	Grassley	Murkowski
Byrd	Gregg	Murray
Campbell	Harkin	Nickles
Chafee	Hatch	Nunn
Coats	Hatfield	Packwood
Cochran	Heflin	Pell
Cohen	Helms	Pressler
Conrad	Hollings	Pryor
Coverdell	Hutchison	Reid
Craig	Inhofe	Robb
D'Amato	Inouye	Rockefeller
Daschle	Jeffords	Santorum
DeWine	Johnston	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kassebaum	Shelby
Dole	Kempthorne	Simon
Domenici	Kennedy	Simpson

Smith	Stevens	Thurmond
Snowe	Thomas	Warner
Specter	Thompson	

NAYS—14

Baucus	Feingold	McCain
Bingaman	Kerry	Moseley-Braun
Bradley	Kerry	Roth
Brown	Kohl	Wellstone
Faircloth	Kyl	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on H.R. 1854 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1854) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of July 28, 1995.)

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring the legislative conference report to the floor of the Senate this morning. I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to Senator MURRAY. While we did not agree on every issue as we worked our way through this, we did agree to work together to bring a bill to the floor that the Senate could support and, in fact, could be proud of.

We began this process early in the year with a resolution being passed in conference indicating we wanted to make substantial reductions in funding of the legislative branch.

We have, under this bill, reduced spending for legislative operations by almost 9 percent. That is a reduction in

real terms from last year's level. Again, not some projected increase and a reduction from that but from actual levels from last year.

We, in fact, did take on some controversial issues, and they were debated in full on the floor of the Senate with respect to the Office of Technology Assessment. In conference, there was further debate on that issue and the House, in fact, receded to the Senate's position and agreement was reached that the Office of Technology Assessment should be eliminated.

In addition to that, the bill called for—well, I should back up. The resolution passed earlier in the year by the Republican conference called for a 25-percent reduction in the General Accounting Office. We have, in essence, reached that objective, but we are going to do it in a 2-year period.

Under this bill, or with this conference report, we will reach the objective of a 15-percent reduction in the General Accounting Office in 1996, with the remainder of those reductions to take place in the next fiscal year.

Again, we worked with Chuck Bowsler on this issue, and our feeling was that rather than for us to micromanage how these reductions would be made over this 2-year period, we concluded it would be best to work with the GAO and, in essence, ask them to devise a plan about how they would reach those objectives.

They came back to us with a proposal. We felt, again, listening to what they had proposed and asking us to give them some flexibility, which we have done in this conference report, there was general agreement that we should go forward with the effort to reach that goal. In fact, we have done that now, and I think that both the House and the Senate can be proud of the approach that we took with respect to the General Accounting Office.

In addition to that, we suggested that the Sergeant at Arms and other support agencies of the Congress should make reductions. There is a 15-percent reduction in committee staffs. We asked the Sergeant at Arms, the Secretary of the Senate, and others, to meet a goal of a 12.5-percent cut. Some of those agencies—in fact, the Sergeant at Arms came up with cuts of greater than 12.5 percent.

So all in all, Mr. President, I will say that we have reached our objective. We have done it in a manner the Senate can be proud. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table relating to the conference agreement be printed in the RECORD.

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