

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to co-sponsor this new Indonesian assistance legislation, which will also be very important to our export base and to our entire economy and foreign policy.

A CHRONOLOGY OF IMPORTANT POLITICAL AND CULTURAL EVENTS IN PUERTO RICO (1493-1997)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a subject which is of great importance to many of us in my community, and certainly should be of great importance to all Americans.

Tomorrow we will observe, July 25, 1998, the 100th anniversary of the relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. One hundred years ago, the United States troops, during the Spanish-American War, invaded Puerto Rico, and since then Puerto Rico for these 100 years has been a territory of the United States.

Tomorrow, throughout the 50 states and on the island of Puerto Rico, there will be different groups involved in different forms of observances or celebrations. Some will celebrate the day claiming that, in their belief, this relationship has been the best thing that ever happened to the Island of Puerto Rico. Others, on the other hand, will lament the relationship and feel that it has been totally unfair.

Some groups on one side, as I said, will claim that nothing has gone wrong for these 100 years, and some folks on the other side will say that nothing has gone right for these 100 years.

I believe that somewhere in between is the truth. But in order to really speak about this subject and how we got here and where we are and where all Americans should begin to deal with this issue, I think it is important to take just a couple of minutes to talk a little bit about the history of how we got here.

Puerto Rico, as so many of you may know, was discovered in 1493 by Christopher Columbus, and from then to 1898 it was a colony of Spain. In 1508, the first Governor in Puerto Rico was assigned, and his name was Juan Ponce de Leon, or, as he is better known within the 50 states, as Ponce de Leon.

The years went on, and Puerto Rico remained no better than a full colony of Spain. But by 1865, nearly 400 years later, there was already discussion between the Spanish government and the Island of Puerto Rico in terms of creating a new arrangement.

Therefore in 1865, a royal decree was issued convoking delegates from Cuba and Puerto Rico to Madrid to discuss possible reforms to the colonial regime. The Puerto Rican delegates go there and they speak about decentralizing the municipal government, having more powers as people, taking

some of the powers from the Governor, who was appointed by Spain, and abolishing slavery. No accord is reached, and the delegates who speak out for such reforms are in fact persecuted. Meanwhile, back in New York, the Republican Society of Cuba and Puerto Rico is established to promote the cause of independence for both islands.

In 1895 the Puerto Rican section of the governing body of the Cuban Revolutionary Party is established in New York, and Puerto Ricans at that time adopt their own flag, which is the same as the Cuban flag, with the colors reversed. Jose Marti is the leader of the party, and it is right here within the 50 states, in New York, that the movement against Spain for independence for Puerto Rico comes into play.

However, something happens on the way to 1898. Spain, for whatever reason, begins to realize that times have to change, and so Spain begins to discuss the possibility of granting autonomy to the Island of Puerto Rico.

On February 9, 1898, Puerto Rico's autonomous government is inaugurated with a provisional cabinet. It provided a high degree of administrative autonomy for Puerto Rico, and, under the charter, the Island was governed by the local parliament, composed of two chambers and a Governor general. The chambers were the Administrative Council, which were elected, and a version of the House of Representatives, popularly elected.

These chambers had full legislative authority except over such matters that the Spanish government wanted to keep, and these folks were then allowed to go to Spain and represent the Puerto Rican community, the Island of Puerto Rico, in Spain.

It is interesting to note that in this agreement the people representing Puerto Rico in Spain had actually reached more autonomy and more powers than the current delegate from Puerto Rico enjoys as a Member of the U.S. Congress.

But that could not take place, because, in the meantime, on February 15, the sinking of the American ship the *Maine* provided an immediate reason for the Spanish-American war. During that war, elections are held in Puerto Rico and this government, which then will represent Puerto Rico in Spain with many more powers, is elected.

On July 25, after the defeat of the Spanish in Cuba, General Nelson Miles leads an American landing in Guanica on the southern coast of Puerto Rico. On October 18th of that year, San Juan surrenders, and a U.S. military government is established in Puerto Rico.

On December 10, the treaty of Paris is signed and the Spanish-American War ends, and Puerto Rico is given to the United States, the political and civil rights of its inhabitants to be determined by the U.S. Congress.

From then on, Puerto Rico and the United States for a couple of years try to figure out what that relationship

will be. But through 1899, in a few years, a military government continues.

Nothing really changes until 1900, when a new act is passed here which ended the military administration and set up a civil government. Very little self-government, however, was granted. The President would appoint a Governor, the members of the upper legislative house in Puerto Rico, and the executive council, where no Puerto Rican was allowed to serve, and the judges of the Supreme Court. Only the House of Representatives on the island was wholly elected by the people in Puerto Rico, and then it was determined that Puerto Rico would have a commissioner who would serve in the House of Representatives with no voting status.

In 1904, Puerto Ricans at that time are not granted U.S. citizenship. They become in fact citizens of Puerto Rico. An argument, by the way, that continues to be dealt with today, because many people still wonder if in imposing American citizenship later, that Puerto Rican citizenship in fact was done away with. Everything then is run by the United States Congress.

□ 1615

In 1917, a very important day in the history, on March 2, the Jones Act comes into effect, and by it, Congress determines that all Puerto Ricans born in Puerto Rico will be American citizens. Since that date, everybody born on the island of Puerto Rico is an American citizen. The only difference and the most important difference, and perhaps the tragic difference, is that if you are born in Puerto Rico you are an American citizen and you move to any of the 50 States, you enjoy the same rights as any citizen within those 50 States, but if you remain on the island of Puerto Rico, still an American citizen, you do not enjoy the same rights as the other 50 States.

That puts into play then the question, what kind of American citizenship is it? Is it possible for us to actually have granted different kinds of American citizenship, one for those who live within the 50 States, and one for those who live outside? To this day, there are very bright people arguing that it is impossible to have granted 2 different kinds, but the effect is that there are 2 different kinds of citizenship, and they express themselves differently.

Nothing then really changes in Puerto Rico until 1950. What happens in those years is that a governor is appointed, and there are different situations that are created. But during that period of time, an independence movement grows, which continues to demand, as it did during the period with Spain, that Puerto Rico be liberated and in fact be given its independence.

That independence movement is persecuted heavily, to the point where its leader, Pedro Albizu Campos, is a man who is jailed for over 27 years for advocating for independence of Puerto Rico

during that time. Also, there are incidents where violent acts are committed and force is used both by the government and by citizens.

At that time also a party grows, various parties grow in Puerto Rico, one of them being the Republican Party, a statehood party, an independence party, a party that wants to take the present status in the 1930s and 1940s and bring it to a new relationship, one that is not statehood or independence.

Finally in the early 1950s it is decided that Congress will offer the Puerto Rico community in Puerto Rico something called commonwealth status. Commonwealth allows for certain rights to be carried out on the island, but commonwealth still does not provide for the ability to vote for President, for the ability to vote for 6 or 7 Members of Congress as Puerto Rico would be entitled to, or for the ability to vote for 2 Senators. On the other hand, commonwealth also does not allow for Puerto Rico's independence. So I think we have to fully understand, and I think the problem that we face these days when we discuss this issue and as we celebrate, commemorate, observe or lament over the 100-year relationship, tomorrow, July 25, is the fact that such a large number of Americans, if not the vast majority, have no idea what the relationship is between the United States and Puerto Rico.

If one goes through any neighborhood in this country and you ask people, are you aware that all people who live on the island of Puerto Rico are citizens like you, you would be shocked to find a large number of people do not have the slightest idea. If you then ask them, do you know that Puerto Ricans served in our wars and participated in our wars and were drafted just like all other Americans when we had a draft, the answer would be no, I did not know that. If you then tell them that they were and that they are citizens and they still do not vote for President, that would shock anywhere, I would say, from 75, 80, 90 percent of the American people who are not aware of the relationship. I think what will happen tomorrow and throughout the rest of this year is more and more people will become aware of the relationship and become aware of the need to speak about where the future of that relationship should take us.

Now, let me digress for a second and just set myself up as an example of the uniqueness or the embarrassment of that relationship. I was born in Puerto Rico. I came to New York, as so many Puerto Ricans did, when I was a very young child. I studied in New York, I became involved in politics, I served in the State assembly; I then came here in 1990. I am a Member of Congress. One cannot really express better fulfillment of one's citizenship than what I have accomplished personally, yet my cousins who live on the island of Puerto Rico do not have the same rights I have, the difference being that I moved and they did not.

That is almost to suggest that if one stays in Texas or one stays in New York, one would have less rights than if one came to California. Well, I am sure there are probably some Californians who would like Texans and New Yorkers to have less rights, but that is just the way we behave in this country. The fact of life is that these folks are there with a totally different system of government overseeing them.

So the commonwealth came in and the commonwealth was set up basically to tell the United Nations, I believe, look, we are obeying the rules, we are doing what you wanted us to do; we do not have a situation that can create a problem for anybody. Puerto Rico is not a colony.

Now, in order to fully understand how people feel about the different status options, one has to understand that in the early 1950s there was a strong, and in the 1940s and 1930s, a strong nationalist movement, a movement that wanted independence for Puerto Rico, and that movement in history will speak to this more and more every day, was discredited, both by people here in Washington and people who lent themselves to that in Puerto Rico.

It was suggested somehow that if one wanted independence for Puerto Rico, one wanted the worst for the island, one was not a good American, one was not a good Puerto Rican, and that was the way people were treated. So many of its leadership was jailed. Within a democracy, Puerto Rico being an arm of the United States, if you will, is supposed to behave in a democratic fashion, and yet to the folks who supported independence, they were, many of them were just discredited and many of them were jailed.

In 1952, after the commonwealth issue came in, and by the way, the way commonwealth came in was the United States gave the people of Puerto Rico a choice: Commonwealth, yes or no. There has never been, and we should note this at this moment, there has never been a congressionally, federally sponsored vote on the island of Puerto Rico which has asked the people of Puerto Rico, do you support independence, do you support Statehood, or do you support remaining the way you are now, or making changes? There have been different kinds of votes to speak to that, but never the full question asked.

So in the early 1950s, the question was, do you want to become a commonwealth, or do you want to remain the kind of territory you are now? Yes or no. So, of course, most of the people voted yes to better the conditions, because as my friend from Guam, BOB UNDERWOOD has said at times, there are bad colonies and there are slightly better off colonies, and people at that time opted to become I guess a better off colony, but still did not have the rights of an independent nation or a State. They were allowed to pick their own Constitution, write their own Constitution. But get this: Anything in the

Constitution had to be approved by the Federal Government, and Puerto Rico cannot pass any laws that will not be accepted by Congress. If so, then they just cannot continue to be as laws in Puerto Rico.

So for all of these 40 years, 50 years, Puerto Rico has been a commonwealth of the United States, and during that time, on many occasions, there have been attempts to solve the present status dilemma.

On July 23, 1967, based on the recommendation of the Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, a plebiscite, an election was held, to determine which status Puerto Ricans want among commonwealth, Statehood or independence. Little more than 66 percent of all registered voters participated.

Now, for us in the States 66 percent is a large turnout, but Puerto Rico is a place where 85, 90 percent of the people vote, so when 66 percent turns out, it means there was kind of dissent on the issue on the ballot. The popular Democratic Party which defends commonwealth defended commonwealth in the campaign. A problem developed in the Republican Party which supported statehood with the old guard saying we will not participate and the younger guard saying we will, and then the Independence Party abstained from the election at all.

So basically we had half of the Statehood Party saying we will not participate, all of the independence movement saying, it is not a fair plebiscite, and only the Commonwealth Party participating, and the results indicated just that: Commonwealth received 60 percent of the vote, statehood nearly 39, and independence less than 1 percent.

The statehooders who participated in the plebiscite and went on and formed their own party, the new Progressive Party which got the governor re-elected, and it was the first defeat for the Democratic Party in 28 years. By the way, just for clarification, the fact that they call themselves Popular Democrats has really nothing to do with the Democratic Party in this country, it is just a title.

In 1970, President Nixon said it is time to do something, let us talk about statehood or independence for Puerto Rico, but nothing happened. Again, in 1971 the same thing. In 1977, and every year since then there has been a discussion as to what the future of Puerto Rico will be. Then, finally, this year, for the first time in a long time, and a bill was passed here by one of our colleagues, sponsored by one of our colleagues on the Republican side, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), which would allow the choice between the present commonwealth, statehood or independence.

The bill was supported and is supported by those who support statehood; it is supported by those who support independence; it is not supported by the Commonwealth Party, because

they feel that in no way does it really speak to what they wish to be. What the bill does is speak to what we are, to what Puerto Rico is, to what the relationship is, and therein lies the problem.

The United States has spent, our country has spent a lot of time and a lot of energy basically suggesting to the world what democratic principles they should follow, and I think that there is not a single person listening or watching us that does not agree that we have a role to play in promoting democracy throughout the world.

I think the big question we have to ask ourselves, and especially the younger people in this country who will be around for a long, long time have to ask is, is it right for this country on one hand to preach democracy throughout the world and on the other hand hold for 100 years tomorrow a colony, a territory in the Caribbean. For the Puerto Rican community, the pain goes deeper. Before these 100 years which will be culminated tomorrow, we spent 405 years with Spain. That is 505 years of a colonial status, the longest running colony in the world.

Now, understand that our government, for the first time in passing the bill on the House floor, admitted in legislation, in writing that Puerto Rico, in fact, was a territory of the United States. For years we have been telling the U.N. that we were something else. No, Puerto Rico is a commonwealth that has a special understanding. Look, it is very simple. If you do not have the same rights other American citizens have, you can call it what you want, it is not a state, it is not an independent nation, it is a colony.

Why should this be important to all Americans? Why should all Americans be concerned with this issue? Well, because we have invaded Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico did not invade us, so we have to eventually come to a conclusion on this subject.

Secondly, one cannot have nearly 4 million, 3.8 American citizens living in Puerto Rico not enjoying the same rights that other Americans have.

□ 1630

So I think the time has come, and perhaps that is what this observance will begin tomorrow. For this Congress, for this Senate, for the American people, for the American media to become aware of the issue and begin to discuss the possibility of finding a solution.

For this Congressman, the solution is very simple. Either we take Puerto Rico in as the 51st State of the Union, or we grant them, work with them on attaining full independence.

I believe, unlike some of my colleagues and unlike some people on the island or in the Puerto Rican communities in the United States, I believe that the Puerto Rican people on the island are fully equipped, talented enough, and intelligent enough to be the 51st State of the Union. I also be-

lieve that those folks are talented enough, educated enough, to be a successful independent Nation.

What they should not continue to be is a people in limbo. And we should not continue to profess to be the safekeepers of democracy and democratic principles and allow that situation to exist.

On many occasions on this House Floor I mix, to the dismay of some of my colleagues, I relate the issues of Cuba and Puerto Rico. People say what is the relationship? Well, the relationship is very simple. We spend a lot of time and energy demanding, quote-unquote, democratic changes in Cuba. How will those democratic changes satisfy us? If they become the kind of changes which allow for people to vote and deal with the issues. That is what we claim.

Well, the same thing has to happen in Puerto Rico. And tomorrow as people observe, lament, or celebrate this relationship, I think it is important that we Americans take a step back and analyze what role, if any, we want to play in this issue.

I do not think, in all honesty, that the American educational system on this issue has done the job it should do. I know for a fact that not enough time is taken, not enough energy is expended, not enough resources, if any, are spent on dealing with this issue in our school system. To educate young people to the fact that we have this situation.

There are, of course, concerns. Most people in this Congress are concentrating on the issue of statehood and they will not move on the issue of Puerto Rico because they are dealing with the issue of statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I said a few seconds ago that the issue could be independence. It does not have to be statehood. Either way, it has to be solved and the problem is that too many people spend too much time determining what kind of a state Puerto Rico would be.

I have two things to say about that. One is if we do not want a state that looks and sounds and acts like Puerto Rico, independence is the solution. Just do that. But if we are now going to question Puerto Ricans to see what kind of good American citizens they would make, it might be 100 years too late. After all, not a single Puerto Rican was question on the issue of language when he was sent off to World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, the Gulf War. That was never a question. Now that has become a question.

Do Puerto Ricans speak English? Should we have a state where the majority of the people do not speak English? I hate to tell my colleagues, but there are states in this country where a majority of people who do not speak English. They speak an English, but the English that they have been speaking for a while now has been badly put together.

We could easily suggest that the time for the relationship has come to a

point where it is time that we solve it simply by taking an up-or-down vote, independence or statehood, and not play with anything in between, and I mean that.

This present status is neither here nor there, neither for us or for the people who live in Puerto Rico. It is an unfair status for us, because we should not have a colony in the Caribbean. And it is an unfair status for the people in Puerto Rico, because they should take their place in the world as a free Nation or take the place as a State of the Union.

And so I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that as we continue to deliberate on this issue, and as the news media covers the fact that tomorrow there will be everything, as I said, from laments to celebration, from joy to sadness, from demonstrations to joyous exuberant demonstrations that we will see on TV and in the newspapers. We will see pictures and video of people celebrating their citizenship and people questioning what kind of citizenship they have. We will see people in Puerto Rico and in the New York community and other Puerto Rican communities throughout the Nation showing glee at the fact that we have reached 100 years with the U.S., and we will also see people lamenting the fact that we have spent these 100 years in this kind of a condition.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for all Americans to try to reach a point. So I would hope that all Americans begin to speak to their representatives and to tell them that we have to solve this situation. I would hope that within the next few years, Puerto Rico and the United States can reach an agreement. An agreement to either bring it in as the 51st state, or to grant it independence. Nothing else is acceptable.

The present status is embarrassing to us. It is embarrassing to the Puerto Rican people. It is wrong. It is unfair.

I can think back, and I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. I can think back to my father and to my mother. They came to New York from Puerto Rico. He, with 2 years of school, and my mother with 6 years of school. They came in 1950, and they brought up my brother and me, my brother Eli and me.

They always told us to do everything that good families do. To work hard, obey the law, to study, and to be good citizens. But those two folks, as much lacking formal education as they were, were always very much aware of the fact that there was something wrong with the relationship and that they would always tell us that that relationship some day had to come to a conclusion.

They are no longer with me. They were not here on March 28, 1990, 38 years exactly to the date when they came from Puerto Rico, when I was elected to Congress and got sworn in. And, in fact, I held my swearing in. I asked then Speaker Foley to swear me

in a day after I was supposed to, so that I could pay tribute to their arrival in New York and their fight to create a community and create a family and to celebrate my accomplishment in their honor.

They always told us that this had to be settled somehow. Tomorrow, as we commemorate the 100th year anniversary, I think it behooves the United States Congress to move ahead and create a better situation for itself and for Puerto Rico. To do anything else would be a shame. To do anything else would be an undemocratic act.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4059

Mr. PACKARD submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4059) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 105-647)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4059) "making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$868,726,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed \$64,269,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$604,593,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided, That of this

amount, not to exceed \$60,846,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$615,809,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided, That of this amount, not to exceed \$38,092,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$553,114,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$26,005,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND (RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

Of the funds appropriated for "Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund" under Public Law 104-196, \$5,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$142,403,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$169,801,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$102,119,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$31,621,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$34,371,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in Military Construction Authorization Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, \$154,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$135,290,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,094,697,000; in all \$1,229,987,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$295,590,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$912,293,000; in all \$1,207,883,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$280,965,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003; for Operation and Maintenance, and for debt payment, \$783,204,000; in all \$1,064,169,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration, and for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$345,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003; for Operation and Maintenance, \$36,899,000; in all \$37,244,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, as the sole source of