United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 10, 2003 No. 101—Part II

Senate

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 177, H.R. 2559, a bill making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2559) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the measure.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of Calendar No. 176, S. 1357, the Senate committee-reported bill, be inserted in lieu thereof, and the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment, and that no points of order be waived by reason of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I am very pleased to join with my ranking member of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator FEINSTEIN of California, in bringing forward for the Senate's consideration the fiscal year 2004 military construction appropriations bill. This is a bipartisan bill which received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Appropriations.

I want to take a moment to say Senator FEINSTEIN is in the Judiciary markup. She is the best ranking member a chairman could ever have. We have a great relationship. We work together well. We see things the same way. And our priorities are the same. So this is very much our bill together, and it would not have been nearly as easy without her wonderful cooperation.

This is a bill that does focus on quality of life for our troops because both Senator FEINSTEIN and I believe it is very important at a time like this, when we are asking so much from our troops, that we do right by them. This bill provides $9.196 billion for military construction, military family housing, and base realignment and closure costs.

This bill is $79 million above the President's budget request, but $1.5 billion below the amount appropriated last year. The budget constraints under which we all are laboring this year did force us to make difficult choices about our spending priorities, but I believe we have crafted a bill that attends both to the President's most pressing requirements and the concerns of Senators.

The bill provides $4.6 billion for military construction, $3.95 billion for military family housing, and $370 million for base realignment and closure.

Our military forces have been severely strained by the extraordinary burdens they have been asked to shoulder in the last several years. They have undertaken nearly 2 years of continuous combat operations in harsh conditions, endured long deployments and reserve activations. They have had to deal with severe disruptions to family life resulting from lengthy separations.

We have asked much of our service personnel and their families; and, for that reason, we have paid special attention in this bill to military construction projects that promote our troops' quality of life.

For example, the bill provides $1.1 billion for 40 new, modern barracks projects; $166 million for the design and construction of new hospital and medical facilities; and $16 million for child development centers to serve our military families.

The intense demands of the past few years have extended well beyond our Active-Duty forces, and no component has borne a heavier burden in that time than our Guard and Reserve Forces who have met the call to duty with a high degree of professionalism.

Unfortunately, military construction for the Guard and Reserve continues to be severely underfunded. The administration's fiscal year budget request for Reserve components was $370 million, a little more than half of what was appropriated last year. This is just inadequate for the task we are asking these components to perform. As a result, this bill increases funding for the Guard and Reserve by 87 percent to $691 million.

This bill differs from the administration's request in only one significant way, and that is in the area of military construction overseas. The budget request included over $1 billion for military construction at U.S. installations outside the United States, much of it destined for facilities constructed for the cold war. For several years, Congress has expressed its concern that our overseas basing structure has not been updated to reflect the realities of the post-cold-war world. Our Nation is dealing with new threats, new strategies, new force structure, new deployment concepts, and new geopolitical realities. Yet a basing structure designed for the cold war endures.

We have questioned the wisdom of continuing to expend taxpayer dollars on overseas facilities that may not be appropriate to the Nation's future military needs. The Defense Department continues to study this issue and has under way an overseas basing and presence study that will lead to, among

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

Printed on recycled paper.

other things, recommendations for a major overhaul of the U.S. overseas basing structure. That study is not yet complete. But in testimony before the Military Construction Subcommittee in April, two of the combatant commanders, General James Jones, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, commander of U.S. European Command, and General Leon LaPorte, commander of U.S. Forces Korea, presented their visions for military basing in their respective areas of responsibility. General Jones described a concept for Europe that features fewer large bases, several smaller, more austere bases in forward locations, and greater use of rotational forces in and out of these facilities rather than permanent stationing of large forces with the attendant support infrastructure.

General LaPorte described a vision for Korea in which U.S. forces are consolidated at a greatly reduced number of facilities located further south on the Korean peninsula than at present.

We have been impressed by the combatant commanders' boldness and creativity in reassessing basing needs, and we believe their respective visions hold great promise for a more efficient and effective basing structure that will enhance the ability of the United States to meet new threats.

When fully developed, this vision will provide a sound basis on which Congress and the administration will be able to determine the future of our overseas basing structure. However, at this point the vision has not yet been developed into a comprehensive plan on which decisions to pursue new construction initiatives can prudently be based.

The overseas basing and presence study involves far more than military facilities. According to public statements of Defense Department officials, it will result in a dramatic change in the disposition of U.S. forces abroad, including where they are based, how they operate, how they move to and from their theaters of operation, and even the number of forces deployed in specific theaters.

In various press accounts, administration officials have acknowledged considering new bases in Australia; Navy ships ported in Vietnam; increased U.S. presence in Malaysia and Singapore; bases in Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia, as well as Senegal, Ghana, Mali, and Kenya; bases on territory of the former Soviet Union; a rotational model for deploying forces overseas; significant reductions to force levels in Germany; a major relocation and possible reformation of forces in the Republic of Korea. Summarizing the extent of the changes under consideration, the Under Secretary of Defense for policy, Douglas Feith, stated:

> Everything is going to move everywhere.

If the sweeping changes under consideration are to be implemented, they will require extensive diplomatic efforts both in the nations in which the United States seeks a new presence and in those where it will reduce or reshape its presence. Because a comprehensive plan is not yet developed, we are unwilling to recommend undertaking extensive new military construction projects that would begin the implementation of a plan without a thorough and deliberate review by Congress. We have been particularly concerned about proposed projects in Europe and Korea.

For example, the budget request includes a number of projects in areas in Germany that, according to public statements of the Army and other Department of Defense officials, are likely to see significant force level reductions.

In a June 23 letter updating the status of planning Europe, General Jones said:

> We have made considerable progress in determining the installations required to support theater goals and the force structure needed to implement our strategy. It is an arduous process but a necessary one. While I realize fully the importance of our progress on these matters, the timeliness, and the effect these decisions will ultimately have on our fiscal year 2004 military construction projects, I must tell you candidly that we have not reached the end point of this process. The changes we are proposing represent the most significant undertaking to realign forces and basis in theater in the past 50 years. The decisions made in the coming weeks will have broad and far-reaching implications; therefore, it is imperative that we get it right.

General Jones is absolutely right. I appreciate his candor. His statements underscore our concern that we are not yet ready to begin implementing the restructuring of our overseas bases in Europe. We have similar concerns about proceeding too fast in Korea.

In the budget amendment received May 1, the administration proposed moving some $213 million in military construction projects to a single base, Camp Humphreys. However, nearly half of that construction is to occur on land that the United States does not yet control. Although the Korean National Defense Minister has pledged to try to buy the land for our use, he is far from clear that this can occur for these projects to be fully executed in fiscal year 2004. According to a July 7 article in the Korea Times, there is fierce local opposition to the expansion of U.S. presence at Camp Humphreys.

The budget amendment also asked to move a $40 million barracks project from an airfield to Camp Humphreys, but then that was reversed.

There are other examples, but I think this is making it clear that we don't really have a fully thought out and reviewed plan from which we can base the needs in Korea. Evaluated against a backdrop of uncertainty about fundamental aspects of a revised overseas basing structure which the department has not yet proposed, the Defense Department's overseas basing and presence plan is not yet sufficiently mature to enable the Senate to commit to extensive new construction. The failure to fund these projects at this time does not indicate dissatisfaction with the general direction in which the Department is headed. We support the direction. But we do believe that Congress should know the extent of the restructuring and the price tag before we determine our Nation's priorities. It would be premature to begin new construction at this time in these areas. We look forward to receiving and evaluating the Department's full recommendations once they become available and taking the time to consider these changes.

Reflecting our continuing concern about this issue, our bill includes a provision establishing an independent commission to thoroughly study the structure of our overseas military facilities and advise Congress on its conclusions. This commission, proposed by Senator FEINSTEIN and myself, would provide Congress with an independent view of the Nation's overseas basing requirements to help inform our decisions about the restructuring of our facilities.

The report accompanying this bill also directs the Defense Department to submit several reports that will aid Congress in its oversight role, including a report on the feasibility of privatization and the use of commercial building practices in barracks construction, a study of the impact of privatized housing on local school districts, and a report on the Department's activities related to perchlorate, a chemical used in solid rocket propellant that has been found in drinking water supplies in 29 States. Senator FEINSTEIN has more to say on perchlorate, but I want to say, this is a concern of mine as well.

While a national standard for perchlorate levels has not yet been established, it is important that the Department of Defense be prepared to deal with this containment at defense installations once a standard is agreed upon.

All of the projects added to the bill have been carefully vetted by the military services. All are top priority for installation commanders, and all are included in the services' future years defense plan.

Madam President, the bill before the Senate is a bipartisan product that was approved by the Appropriations Committee on a vote of 29 to 0. I am pleased to offer it for the Senate's consideration.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I am pleased to join my chairman, Senator HUTCHISON, in recommending the 2004 military construction bill to the Senate.

This has been a very challenging year. The President's budget request for military construction was $1.5 billion below last year's enacted level, a nearly 15 percent reduction in a program that is chronically underfunded. And this year, because of across-the-board constraints on appropriation allocations, we had little room to maneuver beyond the ceiling imposed by the President's budget submission.

The bill that we bring to the Senate provides $9.2 billion for military construction and family housing programs for fiscal year 2004. Within that allocation, we had to shoehorn funding for a large number of critical programs and projects that were not adequately funded in the President's budget request.

In addition to tight budget constraints, we were faced with another challenge this year in determining how to deal with overseas military construction programs at a time when the Defense Department is proposing what has been described as the most sweeping change in America's military presence overseas since World War II.

The President's budget request included more than $1 billion for overseas military construction. Less than 3 months after the budget was submitted, the Defense Department unveiled preliminary plans for a major restructuring of forces in Europe and Korea, and sent Congress a budget amendment to rescind or delete more than half a billion dollars in overseas military construction programs from fiscal year 2003 and the Fiscal Year 2004 request.

It became clear to Senator HUTCHISON and me that the Department was far from finalizing its global realignment plans, and indeed, we continue to read almost daily about different proposals for moving U.S. forces here and there overseas. For this reason, we are recommending a pause in funding a number of proposed construction projects in Europe and Korea until the Defense Department completes its overseas basing review and presents a comprehensive plan to Congress. The overseas basing commission that Senator HUTCHISON and I are proposing in this bill will provide another important layer of oversight to this process.

In Europe, central questions include how many troops will remain permanently stationed there, what basing structure will be needed to support them, and where and what type of forward operating bases and forward operating locations will be needed to support rotational and transitory forces.

In Korea, the issue of where the forces will be realigned has apparently been settled—the U.S. is planning to withdraw troops from Seoul and the Demilitarized Zone and move them to south central South Korea. However, the details of that realignment have yet to be presented to Congress, nor has the Korean government provided the land needed for the realignment.

I am aware that the administration would prefer to bank all of the proposed funding for the realignment of forces in Korea to keep pressure on the South Korean government to transfer the required land to the U.S. military. However, I believe that withholding this funding until the U.S. has actually secured the land is an equally effective incentive for the Korean government if, in fact, it is serious about wanting United States military forces to move out of Seoul.

Moreover, in a year when the administration has slashed the military construction budget by nearly 15 percent, it is unrealistic for the Defense Department to turn around and ask Congress to wager hundreds of millions of dollars that are urgently needed elsewhere on the Korean Government's uncertain timetable.

We have given this matter a great deal of consideration, and I commend Senator HUTCHISON for laying out the position of the subcommittee so clearly and completely in the report accompanying our bill. This explanation should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that the Military Construction Subcommittee understands the importance of maintaining strong military ties to our allies overseas and supports the Defense Department's efforts to ensure that our overseas basing structure reflects the international realities of the post-cold-war environment. We look forward to helping implement the construction elements of the new overseas basing structure once the Defense Department completes its review.

There is another item in the Military Construction bill that is extremely important to me, and that is the environmental clean up of military installations. The fiscal year 2004 bill includes just $370 million for Base Realignment and Closure, BRAC, environmental cleanup. This is a significant drop from last year's funding, and it is a level of funding that I accept only reluctantly, and only because the Defense Department is embarking on a new and ambitious program to raise revenue for environmental cleanup at BRAC sites through land sales. The Navy's BRAC budget, for example, includes $68 million above the appropriated amount in anticipated revenue from land sales, and the Navy anticipates that additional land sales revenue could significantly increase the amount of money available in fiscal year 2004 for environmental cleanup.

I believe that the Defense Department has the responsibility to complete, to the maximum extent possible, the cleanup of military installations closed or realigned through previous BRAC rounds before embarking on a new BRAC round in 2005. I am hopeful that self-financing through land sales will be sufficient to supplement appropriated amounts, but I intend to keep a close watch on this program to ensure that we do not sacrifice momentum by relying too heavily on land sale revenue.

Madam President, I also want to comment on an issue that I have been fighting since this last winter. It is the problem of perchlorate contamination in our country's drinking water. This topic is relevant to the Department of Defense and Military Construction Appropriations as Defense, along with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, uses 90 percent of the perchlorate produced in the United States.

Perchlorate, a chemical used in solid rocket propellant, explosives and munitions has been identified by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as an unregulated toxin. No national standard exists for perchlorate. Perchlorate contamination has been found in drinking water supplies in 29 States, including Arizona, California, Texas, Colorado, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, and New Mexico. More than 300 groundwater wells in California alone are contaminated with perchlorate, as is the Colorado River, which supplies drinking water to more than 15 million people in the Southwest.

I am alarmed about the potential impact of perchlorate contamination at installations that have been closed through the BRAC process as well as at active and inactive Defense sites or where perchlorate has migrated off of current and former Defense or contractor properties to threaten public water supplies.

I am also very disappointed that the Department of Defense has been unresponsive to requests to take a positive leadership role in addressing the concerns of the public and the immediate needs of water agencies large and small as perchlorate is detected in more and more locations. It is also distressing that the Department is resisting the obvious need to test for the presence of perchlorate at BRAC properties or other Defense sites.

The Department of Defense has a moral obligation to the public to address the problem now as the water agencies that have to close wells, or treat their water supplies, are faced with a real problem today. This problem is a result of the activities of the Department or its contractors.

The language I worked to include in the Military Construction Subcommittee report moves the Department of Defense toward addressing the perchlorate problem. This language directs the Department to submit to the Congressional Defense Appropriation Committees the following:

A report on the activities of the Interagency Perchlorate Steering Committee and the activities of the Department on perchlorate as described in the Memo of January 24, 2001 from the Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security to the Secretaries of the military departments and the Defense Logistics Agency.

Identification of sources of perchlorate contamination at BRAC properties and to develop a plan to remediate perchlorate contamination on BRAC sites that can be implemented rapidly once state or Federal perchlorate standards are set.

Finally, I want to address an issue covered in the report where I believe the report language was not wholly accurate, and which I intend to attempt to clarify in conference.

The existing language says, ''The Committee recognizes that, absent a state or Federal standard for perchlorate, the Department of Defense is

under no obligation to remediate perchlorate contamination at defense sites.''

It is more accurate to say that absent a State or Federal standard for perchlorate, there is uncertainty as to the level of perchlorate cleanup that would be required at each site, but there still is a legal obligation to remediate perchlorate contamination under Federal and State statutes including the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and California's Carpenter-Presley-Tanner Hazardous Substance Account Act. Remediation would then proceed on the basis of a site-specific risk assessment or other criteria such as an Applicable, Relevant and Appropriate Requirement.

Madam President, as I stated earlier, this has been a challenging year. Senator HUTCHISON and I were faced with a difficult set of circumstances and a series of hard choices. We were able to develop a military construction program that comes within the constraints of the budget resolution, but I hope that the administration understands the importance of infrastructure as a key element of readiness and quality of life, and will present Congress with a more realistic budget request next year.

I thank the members of my Appropriations Committee staff, Christina Evans, and B.G. Wright, and to Chris Thompson of my personal staff for their hard work on this bill. Also, I wish to express my appreciation to Dennis Ward, of Senator HUTCHISON's staff for his cooperative and bipartisan effort throughout this process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. As I said earlier today, the work Senator DURBIN has done on the legislative appropriations bill is, of course, exemplary, as was Senator FEINSTEIN's, the ranking member of the subcommittee.

As the Senator from Texas knows, last year I made a statement on the floor about the great work these two fine Senators had done on the military construction appropriations bill. My feelings have not changed. I think they have done an excellent job.

I had the honor of also chairing the subcommittee in years past. It is an extremely interesting subcommittee. It does so many important things for the men and women representing this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I rise briefly to make a few remarks about the military construction appropriations bill, and, uncharacteristically, I commend the Appropriations Committee—especially Chairman STEVENS and Chairperson HUTCHISON, as well as the other members of the committee—for reporting out a bill with the lowest number of earmarks I have seen in a long time.

The military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 2004 has $80 million of unrequested and unauthorized military construction projects. Obviously, that is a lot of money. But I point out, to the great credit of the sponsors of this legislation on both sides of the aisle, it is far less than what was added last year, which was $900 billion.

What is egregious and objectionable in this year's military construction appropriations bill that I have not seen to this degree in previous years is the extent to which the appropriators earmarked projects in the unspecified minor construction accounts—totaling $80 million. The authorization committee, once again, was circumvented and the President's budget was not requested. But the fact is that this is a much smaller number than before.

In an effort to contain the wasteful spending inherent in member-requested construction projects, I sponsored, and the Senate adopted, merit-based criteria for evaluating member adds as a part of the fiscal year 1995 Defense Authorization Act. The criteria are:

One, the project is in service's future years defense plan.

Two, the project is mission essential.

Three, the project can be put under contract in the current fiscal year.

Four, the project doesn't conflict with base realignment proposals.

Five, the service can offset the proposed expenditure within that year's budget request.

These criteria have been useful in our efforts to determine programs of merit or nonmerit.

Regarding the reduction in the amount of member adds in this legislation, there are, of course, a couple we have found that I found at least somewhat entertaining. While some of our soldiers and sailors have been on food stamps, we have found a way to provide $1.4 million to replace a working dog kennel. It is good to see that Fido has not been left out of this year's military construction appropriations.

Having said that, I am grateful to my friends on both sides of the aisle, including the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairperson of the Military Construction Subcommittee, for their arduous work on the bill and their continued unequaled support for our men and women in the military. Their attention and commitment to supporting only necessary projects that are high priorities of the services is exemplary this year, in my view.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the projects that were add-ons—not leaving out the replacement of the working dog kennel.

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

Alaska:	
Army:	
Fort Wainwright:	
Chapel Expansion	1.5
Gymnasium Addition	1.5
Fort Richardson Replace Ship Creek Bridge	1.5
Donnelly Training Area Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Facility	1.5
Air Force:	
Elmendorf AFB:	
Repair Alaska Command Headquarters	3.0
Replace Working Dog Kennel	1.4
Army National Guard:	
Angoon, White Mountain Federal Scout Readiness Center	1.0
Manokotak, Toksook Bay Napaskiak Federal Scout Storage Facilities	0.2
Air National Guard:	
Kulis Mobility Storage Warehouse Addition	1.0
California:	
Air Force:	
Travis AFB Air Mobility Operations Group [AMOG] Global Reach Deployment Center	1.4
Army National Guard:	
Sacramento Readiness Center	0.3
Air Force Reserve:	
March Air Reserve Base Upgrade Utilities	1.4
Colorado:	
Defense Wide:	
Denver DoD Hospital [Tricare]	4.0
Florida:	
Navy:	
Pensacola NAS Blue Angels Hanger	1.4
Hawaii:	
Navy:	
Pacific Missile Range Facility Range Operations Complex	1.3
Defense Wide:	
Honolulu Tripler Army Hospital, Biomedical Center	4.6
Idaho:	
Army National Guard:	
Gowen Field TASS Barracks	1.1
Illinois:	
Army National Guard:	
Marseilles Pistol Range Replacement	1.1
Iowa:	
Army National Guard:	
Camp Dodge Readiness Center	1.5
Iowa City Readiness Center/Maintenance Shop	0.8
Kentucky:	
Army	
Fort Knox Dining Facilities Renovation	0.2
Fort Campbell	
Urban Assault Course	0.2
Conversion of Former Officer's Club	1.5
Louisiana:	
Air Force Reserve:	
Barksdale AFB Squadron Operations Center	0.4
Maryland:	
Navy:	
Craderock Naval Special Warfare Center Engineering Management and Logistics Facility	1.5
Indian Head Naval Special Warfare Center Joint Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technology Support Facility	1.2
Mississippi:	
Army National Guard:	
Monticello Readiness Center	0.5
Pascagoula Readiness Center	0.4
Missouri:	
Army National Guard	
Whiteman AFB Aviation Support Facility	1.8
Montana:	
Air Force:	
Malstrom AFB	
Addition/Alteration to Fitness Center	0.7
Corrosion Control Facility	0.5

Nebraska:	
Army National Guard	
Grand Island Aviation Support Facility	1.6
New Hampshire:	
Navy:	
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard Structural Shop Consolidation	1.5
Norfolk Naval Shipyard Suspect Cargo Handling Facility	1.4
New Jersey:	
Army:	
Fort Monmouth Battery Test Facility	0.2
Air Force:	
Lakehurst Combat Offload Ramp	0.4
New Mexico:	
Air Force:	
Holloman AFB War Reserve Material Storage Facility	1.0
New York:	
Army National Guard	
Rochester Aviation Support Facility	1.6
Nevada:	
Army:	
Hawthorne Army Depot Water Treatment Facility	3.0
North Dakota:	
Air National Guard:	
Fargo Repair Maintenance Shop	1.4
Ohio:	
Army National Guard:	
Hamilton Organizational Maintenance Shops	1.5
Air Force:	
Wright-Patterson AFB Fire Crash Rescue Station	1.0
Oregon:	
Air National Guard:	
Klamath Falls Munitions Administration Facility	1.4
Pennsylvania:	
Air Force Reserve:	
Pittsburgh Air Reserve Station Headquarters Building, 911th Airlift Wing	0.7
Rhode Island:	
Army National Guard:	
Kingston, Aviation Support Facility	2.0
South Carolina:	
Air Force:	
Charleston AFB Child Development Center	0.5
South Dakota:	
Army National Guard:	
Watertown Readiness Center	1.2
Sioux Falls Unit Training Equipment Site	0.8
Texas:	
Army:	
Fort Bliss:	
Chaffee (Main) Gate	0.9
Robert E. Lee (Main) Gate	1.2
Tactical Equipment Shop	0.6
Red River Army Depot Wheeled Vehicle Rebuild Facility	2.9
Air Force:	
Lackland AFB Addition/Alteration to Training Annex Fire Station	1.0
Elevated Basic Military Training [BMT] Troop Walk at Carswell Avenue	0.8
Laughlin AFB:	
Fire Department Addition	0.5
Squadron Operations Facility	0.2
Goodfellow AFB Fitness Center	1.5
Utah:	
Air Force:	
Hill Air Force Base Consolidated Software Support Facility	1.7
Washington:	
Air Force:	
Fairchild AFB Mission Support Complex	1.2
Vermont:	
Army National Guard:	
Colchester, Camp Johnson Information Systems Facility	0.5
Air National Guard:	
Burlington Air Mobilization Facility	0.4
West Virginia:	
Defense Wide:	
Birdgeport Biometrics Training Center	1.4
Air National Guard:	
Martinsburg C–5 Upgrades	5.0
Wisconsin:	
Army Reserve:	
Eau Claire Reserve Center	0.6

BUY AMERICA

SEC. 108. Prohibits the procurement of steel unless American producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been allowed to compete.

SEC. 112. Establishes preference for American contractors for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in the Arabian Sea.

TOTAL MEMBER ADDS—$80.1 million

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I thank the kinder and gentler Senator from Arizona. I am very pleased that he looked at our bill and found that we did meet the criteria because that is exactly what we intended to do.

The kennel is for dogs at an Air Force base. The dogs are security dogs, and they do need a place to stay.

Mr. MCCAIN. Might I ask where that is located?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. At Elmendorf Air Force Base. I think the Senator knows that is in Alaska. Dogs in Alaska need a place to stay, too. Maybe it is cold up there and they need shelter. I think it is certainly legitimate.

With that, we did work hard to make the priorities that we thought were right for our military personnel. No one deserves better treatment right now than the military personnel of our country. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his continuing interest in assuring that our military personnel have a quality of life. That has been his hallmark here.

I thank, once again, the chairman of the committee, Senator STEVENS, and Senator INOUYE, the ranking member, Senator BYRD, Senator FEINSTEIN, my ranking member, and our respective staffs. I am very proud of the work we did on the bill, and I do hope our military personnel do see better health care facilities, better barracks, better living quarters, and from this legislation I think they will.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator from Arizona has looked over the managers' package on this bill including 15 different items.

I am only kidding.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, to clarify the record, and before the Senator from Arizona turns into the ''Incredible Hulk,'' there was no managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, when the Senators brought this bill to the full committee—Senators HUTCHISON and FEINSTEIN—I was totally astounded at the consensus on this bill. This is a fairly difficult bill and there are difficult decisions in which the House may not concur. But the two Senators managing the bill proposed decisions for the Senate to which not one Senator has objected. I think that is really a milestone in dealing with this bill.

I congratulate the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California not only for their work product but for their work ethic, working together as a bipartisan team on a very difficult subject. I hope we can bring the bill back from the conference as it stands. I am not sure we can, but it certainly is an extremely good work product dealing with a whole myriad of subjects that affect our bases at home and abroad, and I congratulate the Senators for a marvelous job.

Madam President, we are close to wrap-up. I ask unanimous consent we temporarily set aside the pending business, and Senator DAYTON be allowed to make a statement about Iraq for 15 minutes while we prepare the wrap-up for this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, before we move off this bill, I so appreciate the chairman's remarks. We could not have done it without our excellent staff work. On the majority staff, Dennis Ward has done an incredible job of research. He is the most thorough person we could have on the committee. I appreciate him very much.

Also, Christina Evans and B.G. Wright on Senator FEINSTEIN's staff, without their working relationship being so good, we could not have done so well. I wanted to add that to the record before we moved away from the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, I am informed we will open the Senate tomorrow at 9:15 a.m. We will have 15 minutes of debate and then proceed to the three votes that will be stacked at that time.

I renew my request to permit the Senator to speak as in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

IRAQ

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, I thank the senior Senator from Alaska for making possible my opportunity to speak tonight on a trip to Iraq I took last week with several of our colleagues as members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and Senate Intelligence Committee, led by the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, JOHN WARNER, who is an extraordinary leader of the committee. I do not know if his age is classified or not, but at his age, the kind of