

the Military Selective Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 451 et seq.) to males only.

“(4) In this subsection, the term ‘ground combat exclusion policy’ means the military personnel policies of the Department of Defense and the military departments, as in effect on October 1, 1994, by which female members of the armed forces are restricted from assignment to units and positions below brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground.

“(5) For purposes of this subsection, the continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die.

“(6) For purposes of this subsection, a military career designator is one that is related to military operations on the ground as of May 18, 2005, and applies—

“(A) for enlisted members and warrant officers, to military occupational specialties, specialty codes, enlisted designators, enlisted classification codes, additional skill identifiers, and special qualification identifiers; and

“(B) for officers (other than warrant officers), to officer areas of concentration, occupational specialties, specialty codes, designators, additional skill identifiers, and special qualification identifiers.

“(b) OTHER PERSONNEL POLICY CHANGES.—

(1) Except in a case covered by section 6035 of this title or by subsection (a), whenever the Secretary of Defense proposes to make a change to military personnel policies described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall, not less than 30 days before such change is implemented, submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives notice, in writing, of the proposed change.

“(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a proposed military personnel policy change, other than a policy change covered by subsection (a), that would make available to female members of the armed forces assignment to any of the following that, as of the date of the proposed change, is closed to such assignment:

“(A) Any type of unit not covered by subsection (a).

“(B) Any class of combat vessel.

“(C) Any type of combat platform.”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 651 the following new item:

“652. Notice to Congress of proposed changes in units, assignments, etc. to which female members may be assigned.”.

(b) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICIES WITH REGARD TO THE ASSIGNMENT OF WOMEN.—Not later than March 31, 2006, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report of the Secretary’s review of the current and future implementation of the policy regarding the assignment of women as articulated in the Secretary of Defense memorandum, dated January 13, 1994, and entitled, “Direct Ground Combat Definition and Assignment Rule”. In conducting that review, the Secretary shall closely examine Army unit modularization efforts, and associated personnel assignment policies, to ensure their compliance with the Department of Defense policy articulated in the January 1994 memorandum.

(c) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 542 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is repealed.

In section 825(d) (page 325, line 22), insert after “Defense” the following: “for the Joint

Military Intelligence Program or Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities”.

In section 825(e) (page 325, line 24), insert after “committees” the following: “and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives”.

At the end of subtitle B of title X (page 365, after line 19), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1017. ESTABLISHMENT OF MEMORIAL TO U.S.S. OKLAHOMA.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF SITE FOR MEMORIAL.—The Secretary of the Navy, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall identify an appropriate site on Ford Island, Hawaii, for the location of a memorial to the U.S.S. Oklahoma, which was sunk during the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION.—After the site for the memorial is identified under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall establish and administer a memorial to the U.S.S. Oklahoma as part of the USS Arizona National Memorial, a unit of the National Park System, in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable to lands administered by the National Park Service.

(c) MEMORIALIZATION PLAN.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress a memorialization plan for the portion of Pearl Harbor where United States naval vessels were attacked on December 7, 1941. The Secretary of the Navy shall prepare the plan in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

At the end of title XI (page 411, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1108. VETERANS’ PREFERENCE STATUS FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WHO SERVED ON ACTIVE DUTY DURING THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, AND ENDING AS OF THE CLOSE OF OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.

(a) DEFINITION OF VETERAN.—Section 2108(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by adding “or” after the semicolon; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) served on active duty as defined by section 101(21) of title 38 at any time in the armed forces for a period of more than 180 consecutive days any part of which occurred during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on the date prescribed by Presidential proclamation or by law as the last date of Operation Iraqi Freedom;”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2108(3)(B) of such title is amended by striking “paragraph (1)(B) or (C)” and inserting “paragraph (1)(B), (C), or (D)”.

Redesignate titles I through VIII of division B as titles XXI through XXVIII, respectively.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 293, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is a manager’s amendment which has several components. One component is cruise missile funding for the supersonic cruise missile; another is a USS Oklahoma memorial; another is veterans’ preference. But the heart of this manager’s amend-

ment is the amendment on women in combat, and that is not women in uniform as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) likes to describe it, but women in combat and the exclusion from direct ground combat in the United States Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, let us make it clear to everyone, because clarity is what we all want, there is presently a policy, a DOD policy, put forth by then-Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, that has been adhered to, that continues the American policy and tradition of not having women in direct ground combat. That means manning machine guns, assaulting enemy positions at close range with rifle and bayonet, with tanks, with Bradley fighting vehicles, engaging in firefights; in short, doing all the things that we know now that we have elements of the Marine Special Operations and Army doing in the war against terror.

Now, the committee in asking, in inquiring of the Army as to what their position was on this as they go into the development of the new Army, it became clear that they were not sure.

□ 1530

There were three separate briefing teams sent to the Hill, each of whom had a different position within 3 days as to exactly what the policy would be of excluding women from direct ground combat. As a result of that, we had a provision in the bill that would statutorily take the Army policy, the present policy, and Xerox it, exactly the same policy, but would make it law.

We have had a number of people who have expressed concern about that. We have had also a number of people who want to make sure we maintain that policy and, as a result of that, we have, I think, an excellent compromise, an excellent provision in the bill which says this: if DOD wants to change the existing policy that excludes women from direct ground combat, they have to give Congress 60 continuous legislative days’ notice.

Now, what that means is we have now injected ourselves, as we should, being people who under the Constitution have the obligation of regulating the Armed Forces, we have injected ourselves into any change of this long-standing DOD policy. We will have 60 legislative days, continuous legislative days, in which we can change that policy. We direct the Secretary of Defense to come back to us and tell us how he is going to implement that policy and specifically how he is going to reshape the Army and the Army modularity and comply with that 1994 policy which excludes women from direct ground combat.

This is an excellent provision, Mr. Chairman. And for all the women out there who are concerned about the possibility of being moved into direct ground combat, certainly we make it very clear they will not be, by action of the U.S. Congress.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I will not, in the end, oppose it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) will control the time in opposition.

There was no objection.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise to express my deep concern about the portion of the Hunter amendment that amends the language regarding women in combat. Currently, women in the military are barred from direct ground combat positions by policy and by the will of the American people. However, while I recommend that the Hunter amendment get passed, I want to make it crystal clear to the American people that this does not go far enough in amending what previously had been put in the bill, and it potentially infringes on the right of women to serve in combat support positions alongside men, positions that women currently hold. Equally important, it also greatly reduces the ability of the Pentagon to make needed personnel changes at a time of war.

For the last 2 weeks, Mr. Chairman, women in the military have been under assault by the majority in the House Committee on Armed Services. While this latest version of the Hunter amendment is an improvement over the horrendous language he included in the bill 2 weeks ago, this is like a school yard bully taking your lunch money, getting caught, giving you half the money back and then demanding you thank him for it. We should not be in this position in the first place.

At a time when our Armed Forces are overstretched and Army recruiting and retention has hit the skids, we should not appear to be restricting patriotic Americans who want to serve their country in the military. This entire effort sends a harmful message to the women serving today on the front lines of Iraq that Congress is considering the right that they have achieved to serve their country through military service may be in jeopardy.

Just a short while ago, this Congress was praising Jessica Lynch and Shoshana Johnson for their service. We should be thanking women in uniform, not limiting their opportunities. Suicide bombers do not discriminate, why should we?

Mr. Chairman, this is an ill-thought-out policy that has been proposed, revised, revised again, and argued all at the last minute without any hearings in the subcommittee or the committee. Apparently, in offering the most recently altered amendment, even the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) recognizes he had gone too far. While far from undoing the mixed signal this effort to change the rules has sent to women and men serving with distinction in a very dangerous environment, this amendment corrects the most egregious language currently in the bill and should be supported.

I guess what is most disappointing about this issue is that nothing has been done to repair the damage that this effort inflicts on women serving in the military today. Repairing the damage in this bill still begs the question: What are we going to do to restore the trust of our servicewomen?

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. PUTNAM). The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. Mr. Chairman, we live sometimes in a fantasy world here in Washington, D.C. Let me take us to the real world. The real world in direct ground combat is what you saw in Fallujah, where people were assaulting heavily fortified areas, very close range, fierce firefights, rocket-propelled grenades, machine gun fire, and in the end, 78 dead Marines, KIA.

I have here an article: "War Makes Recruiting Women Tough." Reading from the Columbia State Journal: "As the Iraq war wears on and casualties mount, young women are marching away from the Army." This is the real world, not the fantasy world the gentlewoman speaks about. "The number of women in Army recruiting classes has dropped 20 percent in the last 5 years. Why the drop? 'It's the war,' Army spokesman Douglas Smith said, adding 'recruiting of women has slipped, despite larger signing bonuses and an increase in the number of recruiters.'"

The facts are that 90 percent of the women polled who are in the Army do not want to go in direct ground combat. There may be people here in Washington, D.C. who want to send young women into direct ground combat, but the vast majority of those in the military do not want that. And the real reassurance to American moms and dads sitting around the breakfast table talking to their youngsters about joining the military is that they will not be sent into direct ground combat. And if a proposal is made to change that, then the U.S. Congress, under its obligation, will have a requirement to review that policy and act before it becomes the new policy.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I think that several of our colleagues want to really put this issue aside, but I think it has had an impact. I spoke to Sergeant Cynthia Hanna this morning. Sergeant Hanna works for the San Diego Police Department and is a Marine Corps veteran. Like

many women in Iraq right now, Sergeant Hanna was an integral part of the fight. But let me tell you where her fight is now. Her fight is on the streets of San Diego.

I thought Sergeant Hanna summed up the issue best. Not once did she talk about whether this is a Democrat or Republican issue. She said, "The desire to serve has never been about women's equality to the exclusion of readiness considerations. The struggle," the struggle, "is about the privilege of serving one's country without artificial barriers based solely on gender. Women's struggle for a place in the military has been about seeking the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship. The struggle is about women being judged by the same standards as men in any job for which they can qualify. It has always been about being able to pursue a career based on individual qualifications rather than unrelated stereotypes."

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of the thousands of women serving their country bravely and honorably in the armed services today.

Two weeks ago, in the Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services, there was an amendment put forward by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) and it was wrong, and I told him it was wrong; but they passed it. A week ago, they changed it because it was so bad. And I told him, I do not even know what we are voting on, and yet the majority passed it. Today, they have a third amendment, because it was wrong and it did not make sense. This one, we can live with. It is just about reporting and reporting to the Congress.

But I will tell my colleagues something I believe is true. Not every man nor every woman makes a good soldier. But if a woman can do it, and she wants to do it, and she is good at it, then let her do it. As I have said before, this is not a question of equal opportunity; it is a question of our national security.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, there are 2,800 job opportunities open to women in the military. This provision, very appropriately, injects Congress into the policy role of making the determination, if it should ever be proposed by DOD to move women into direct ground combat. That injects Congress into that policy role.

And if anybody makes that profound determination, it has to be Congress. I hope it is never made, but certainly we should not stand by and have such a profound decision made without the U.S. Congress weighing in. This guarantees our participation.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Chairman, first let me thank the gentleman from California for his leadership and hard work on this issue and for drafting an amendment that confirms Congress' constitutional duty to oversee the military. Any decision to allow women to serve in direct ground combat is a decision that must be made by Congress.

Our men and women in Iraq, Afghanistan, Bosnia, and around the world are serving our Nation with distinction and honor. In the Global War on Terror, there are no designated front lines and at any moment even a mess hall can become a combat zone.

The jobs that place our military members in direct ground combat are currently closed to women.

The amendment before us today will allow congressional oversight in any decision to open direct ground combat specialties to women by requiring notification by the Defense Secretary and Congress. It also requires a report from the Secretary in March of 2006 which will allow Congress to further explore this issue.

Let me be clear, this amendment does not impact any specialties currently open to women. All women will continue serving in their current roles. Any change in current roles would be completely unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 20 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), amendment No. 24 offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS), amendment No. 12 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), and amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. GOODE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 184, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—245

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aderholt | Gallegly | Myrick |
| Akin | Garrett (NJ) | Neugebauer |
| Alexander | Gerlach | Ney |
| Bachus | Gibbons | Northup |
| Baker | Gilchrest | Norwood |
| Barrett (SC) | Gillmor | Nunes |
| Barrow | Gingrey | Nussle |
| Bartlett (MD) | Gohmert | Osborne |
| Barton (TX) | Goode | Otter |
| Bass | Goodlatte | Oxley |
| Beauprez | Gordon | Pence |
| Biggart | Granger | Peterson (MN) |
| Bilirakis | Graves | Peterson (PA) |
| Bishop (GA) | Green (WI) | Petri |
| Bishop (NY) | Gutknecht | Pickering |
| Bishop (UT) | Hall | Pitts |
| Blackburn | Harris | Platts |
| Blunt | Hart | Poe |
| Boehlert | Hayes | Pombo |
| Boehner | Hayworth | Pomeroy |
| Bonilla | Hefley | Porter |
| Bonner | Hensarling | Price (GA) |
| Bono | Herger | Pryce (OH) |
| Boozman | Hobson | Radanovich |
| Boren | Hoekstra | Ramstad |
| Boswell | Hooley | Regula |
| Boucher | Hostettler | Rehberg |
| Boustany | Hulshof | Reichert |
| Boyd | Hunter | Renzi |
| Bradley (NH) | Hyde | Reynolds |
| Brady (TX) | Inglis (SC) | Rogers (AL) |
| Brown-Waite, | Israel | Rogers (KY) |
| Ginny | Issa | Rogers (MI) |
| Burgess | Istook | Rohrabacher |
| Burton (IN) | Jenkins | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Calvert | Jindal | Royce |
| Camp | Johnson (CT) | Ryan (OH) |
| Cannon | Johnson (IL) | Ryan (WI) |
| Cantor | Johnson, Sam | Ryun (KS) |
| Capito | Jones (NC) | Saxton |
| Carter | Keller | Schwarz (MI) |
| Case | Kelly | Sensenbrenner |
| Castle | Kennedy (MN) | Sessions |
| Chabot | Kind | Shadegg |
| Chandler | King (IA) | Shaw |
| Chocola | King (NY) | Shays |
| Coble | Kingston | Sherwood |
| Cole (OK) | Kirk | Shimkus |
| Conaway | Knollenberg | Shuster |
| Costello | Kuhl (NY) | Simpson |
| Cox | LaHood | Smith (NJ) |
| Cramer | Latham | Smith (TX) |
| Crenshaw | LaTourette | Sodrel |
| Cubin | Leach | Spratt |
| Culberson | Lewis (CA) | Stearns |
| Cunningham | Lewis (KY) | Sullivan |
| Davis (KY) | Linder | Sweeney |
| Davis (TN) | LoBiondo | Tancred |
| Davis, Jo Ann | Lucas | Tanner |
| Davis, Tom | Lungren, Daniel | Taylor (MS) |
| Deal (GA) | E. | Taylor (NC) |
| DeFazio | Mack | Terry |
| DeLay | Manzullo | Thomas |
| Dent | Marchant | Tiahrt |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | Marshall | Tiberi |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Matheson | Turner |
| Doolittle | McCarthy | Udall (CO) |
| Drake | McCaul (TX) | Upton |
| Duncan | McCotter | Walden (OR) |
| English (PA) | McCrery | Walsh |
| Etheridge | McHenry | Wamp |
| Everett | McHugh | Weldon (FL) |
| Feeney | McIntyre | Weldon (PA) |
| Ferguson | McKeon | Weller |
| Fitzpatrick (PA) | McMorris | Westmoreland |
| Foley | Mica | Whitfield |
| Forbes | Miller (FL) | Wicker |
| Ford | Miller (MI) | Wilson (SC) |
| Fortenberry | Miller, Gary | Wolf |
| Fossella | Moore (KS) | Young (AK) |
| Fox | Moran (KS) | Young (FL) |
| Franks (AZ) | Murphy | |
| Frelinghuysen | Musgrave | |

NOES—184

| | | |
|-------------|---------|-------|
| Abercrombie | Allen | Baca |
| Ackerman | Andrews | Baird |

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Baldwin | Holden | Paul |
| Bean | Holt | Payne |
| Becerra | Honda | Pearce |
| Berkley | Hoyer | Pelosi |
| Berman | Inslee | Price (NC) |
| Berry | Jackson (IL) | Putnam |
| Blumenauer | Jackson-Lee | Rahall |
| Brady (PA) | (TX) | Rangel |
| Brown (OH) | Jefferson | Reyes |
| Brown, Corrine | Johnson, E. B. | Ross |
| Butterfield | Jones (OH) | Rothman |
| Buyer | Kanjorski | Roybal-Allard |
| Capps | Kaptur | Ruppersberger |
| Capuano | Kennedy (RI) | Rush |
| Cardin | Kildee | Sabo |
| Cardoza | Kilpatrick (MI) | Salazar |
| Carnahan | Kline | Sánchez, Linda |
| Carson | Kolbe | T. |
| Clay | Kucinich | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Cleaver | Langevin | Sanders |
| Clyburn | Lantos | Schakowsky |
| Conyers | Larsen (WA) | Schiff |
| Cooper | Larson (CT) | Lee |
| Costa | Levin | Schwartz (PA) |
| Crowley | Lewis (GA) | Scott (GA) |
| Cuellar | Lewis (VA) | Scott (VA) |
| Cummings | Lipinski | Serrano |
| Davis (AL) | Lofgren, Zoe | Sherman |
| Davis (CA) | Lowey | Simmons |
| Davis (FL) | Lynch | Skelton |
| Davis (IL) | Maloney | Slaughter |
| DeGette | Markey | Smith (WA) |
| Delahunt | Matsui | Snyder |
| DeLauro | McCollum (MN) | Solis |
| Dicks | McDermott | Souder |
| Dingell | McGovern | Stark |
| Doggett | McKinney | Strickland |
| Doyle | McNulty | Stupak |
| Dreier | Meehan | Tauscher |
| Edwards | Meek (FL) | Thompson (CA) |
| Ehlers | Meeks (NY) | Thompson (MS) |
| Emanuel | Melancon | Thornberry |
| Engel | Menendez | Tierney |
| Eshoo | Michaud | Towns |
| Evans | Miller (NC) | Udall (NM) |
| Farr | Miller, George | Van Hollen |
| Fattah | Mollohan | Velázquez |
| Filner | Moore (WI) | Vislosky |
| Flake | Moran (VA) | Wasserman |
| Frank (MA) | Murtha | Schultz |
| Gonzalez | Nadler | Waters |
| Green, Al | Napolitano | Watson |
| Green, Gene | Neal (MA) | Watt |
| Grijalva | Oberstar | Waxman |
| Gutierrez | Obey | Weiner |
| Harman | Olver | Wexler |
| Hastings (FL) | Ortiz | Wilson (NM) |
| Hersteth | Owens | Woolsey |
| Higgins | Pallone | Wu |
| Hinche | Pascrell | Wynn |
| Hinojosa | Pastor | |

NOT VOTING—4

| | | |
|------------|---------------|------------|
| Brown (SC) | Hastings (WA) | Millender- |
| Emerson | | McDonald |

□ 1608

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota and Messrs. BROWN of Ohio, DINGELL, ENGEL and SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ISSA, ISTOOK, CANTOR, KNOLLENBERG and BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MRS. JO ANN DAVIS OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. PUTNAM). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 413, noes 16, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

AYES—413

Abercrombie Cunningham Hoekstra
Aderholt Davis (AL) Holden
Akin Davis (CA) Holt
Alexander Davis (FL) Honda
Allen Davis (IL) Hooley
Andrews Davis (KY) Hostettler
Baca Davis (TN) Hoyer
Bachus Davis, Jo Ann Hulshof
Baird Davis, Tom Hunter
Baker Deal (GA) Hyde
Barrett (SC) DeFazio Inglis (SC)
Barrow DeGette Inslie
Bartlett (MD) Delahunt Israel
Barton (TX) DeLauro Issa
Bass DeLay Istook
Bean Dent Jackson (IL)
Beauprez Diaz-Balart, L. Jackson-Lee
Becerra Diaz-Balart, M. (TX)
Berkley Dicks Jefferson
Berman Dingell Jenkins
Berry Doggett Jindal
Biggart Doolittle Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis Doyle Johnson (IL)
Bishop (GA) Drake Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY) Dreier Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT) Duncan Jones (NC)
Blackburn Edwards Jones (OH)
Blunt Ehlers Kanjorski
Boehlert Emanuel Kaptur
Boehner Engel Keller
Bonilla English (PA) Kelly
Bonner Eshoo Kennedy (MN)
Bono Etheridge Kennedy (RI)
Boozman Evans Kildee
Boren Everett Kilpatrick (MI)
Boswell Farr Kind
Boucher Fattah King (IA)
Boustany Feeney King (NY)
Boyd Ferguson Kingston
Bradley (NH) Filner Kirk
Brady (PA) Fitzpatrick (PA) Kline
Brady (TX) Flake Knollenberg
Brown (OH) Foley Kolbe
Brown, Corrine Forbes Kuhl (NY)
Brown-Waite, Ford LaHood
Ginny Fortenberry Langevin
Burgess Fossella Lantos
Burton (IN) Foxx Larsen (WA)
Butterfield Franks (AZ) Larson (CT)
Buyer Frelinghuysen Latham
Calvert Gallegly LaTourette
Camp Garrett (NJ) Leach
Cannon Gerlach Levin
Cantor Gibbons Lewis (CA)
Capito Gilchrest Lewis (GA)
Capps Gillmor Lewis (KY)
Capuano Gingrey Linder
Cardin Gohmert Lipinski
Cardoza Gonzalez LoBiondo
Carnahan Goode Lofgren, Zoe
Carson Goodlatte Lowey
Carter Gordon Lucas
Case Granger Lungren, Daniel
Castle Graves E.
Chabot Green (WI) Lynch
Chandler Green, Al Mack
Chocola Green, Gene Maloney
Clay Grijalva Manzullo
Cleaver Gutknecht Marchant
Clyburn Hall
Coble Harman Marshall
Cole (OK) Harris Matheson
Conaway Hart Matsui
Cooper Hastings (FL) McCarthy
Costa Hayes McCaul (TX)
Costello Hayworth McCollum (MN)
Cox Hefley McCotter
Cramer Hensarling McCrery
Crenshaw Herger McGovern
Crowley Herseth McHenry
Cubin Higgins McHugh
Cuellar Hinchey McIntyre
Culberson Hinojosa McKeon
Cummings Hobson McKinney

McMorris Pomeroy Smith (TX)
McNulty Porter Smith (WA)
Meehan Price (GA) Snyder
Meek (FL) Price (NC) Sodrel
Meeks (NY) Pryce (OH) Souder
Melancon Putnam Spratt
Menendez Radanovich Stearns
Mica Rahall Strickland
Michaud Ramstad Stupak
Miller (FL) Rangel Sullivan
Miller (MI) Regula Sweeney
Miller (NC) Rehberg Tancredo
Miller, Gary Reichert Tanner
Miller, George Renzi Tauscher
Mollohan Reyes Taylor (MS)
Moore (KS) Reynolds Taylor (NC)
Moran (KS) Rogers (AL) Terry
Moran (VA) Rogers (KY) Thomas
Murphy Rogers (MI) Thompson (CA)
Murtha Rohrabacher Thompson (MS)
Musgrave Ros-Lehtinen Thornberry
Myrick Ross Tiahrt
Nadler Rothman Tiberi
Napolitano Roybal-Allard Tierney
Neal (MA) Royce Towns
Neugebauer Ruppertsberger Turner
Ney Rush Udall (CO)
Northup Ryan (OH) Udall (NM)
Norwood Ryan (WI) Upton
Nunes Ryun (KS) Van Hollen
Nussle Sabo Velázquez
Oberstar Salazar Velázquez
Obey Sanchez, Loretta Walsh
Oliver Sanders Wamp
Ortiz Saxton Waters
Osborne Schiff Watson
Otter Schwartz (PA) Schwarz (MI)
Owens Scott (GA) Watt
Oxley Scott (VA) Waxman
Pallone Sensesbrenner Weiner
Pascarell Serrano Weldon (FL)
Pastor Sessions Weldon (PA)
Paul Shadegg Weller
Payne Shaw Westmoreland
Pearce Shaw Wexler
Pelosi Shays Whitfield
Pence Sherman Wicker
Peterson (MN) Sherwood Wilson (NM)
Peterson (PA) Shimkus Wilson (SC)
Petri Shuster Wolf
Pickering Simmons Wu
Pitts Simpson Wynn
Platts Skelton Young (AK)
Poe Slaughter Young (FL)
Pombo Smith (NJ)

NOES—16

Ackerman Kucinich Schakowsky
Baldwin Lee Solis
Blumenauer McDermott Stark
Conyers Moore (WI) Wasserman
Frank (MA) Sanchez, Linda Schultz
Gutierrez T. Woolsey

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (SC) Millender-
Emerson McDonald
Hastings (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1616

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 12 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 233, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

AYES—194

Abercrombie Ford Neal (MA)
Ackerman Frank (MA) Obey
Allen Frelinghuysen Oliver
Andrews Gilchrest Owens
Baca Gonzalez Pallone
Baird Gordon Pascrell
Baldwin Green, Al Pastor
Barrow Green, Gene Payne
Bass Grijalva Pelosi
Bean Gutierrez Pomeroy
Becerra Harman Price (NC)
Berkley Hastings (FL) Pryce (OH)
Berman Herseth Ramstad
Biggart Higgins Rangel
Bishop (GA) Hinchey Reyes
Bishop (NY) Hinojosa Rothman
Blumenauer Holt Roybal-Allard
Boehlert Honda Ruppertsberger
Bono Hooley Rush
Boswell Hoyer Sabo
Boucher Inslee Sanchez, Linda
Boyd Israel T.
Bradley (NH) Jackson (IL) Sanchez, Loretta
Brady (PA) Jackson-Lee Sanders
Brown (OH) (TX) Schakowsky
Brown, Corrine Jefferson Schiff
Capito Johnson (CT) Schwartz (PA)
Capps Johnson, E. B. Scott (GA)
Capuano Jones (OH) Scott (VA)
Cardin Kaptur Serrano
Cardoza Kelly Shaw
Carnahan Kennedy (RI) Shays
Carson Kilpatrick (MI) Sherman
Case Kind Simmons
Castle Kirk Slaughter
Chandler Kolbe Smith (WA)
Clay Kucinich Snyder
Cleaver Lantos Solis
Clyburn Larsen (WA) Spratt
Conyers Larson (CT) Stark
Cooper Leach Strickland
Costa Lee Tanner
Cramer Levin Tauscher
Crowley Lewis (GA) Thomas
Cummings Lofgren, Zoe Thompson (CA)
Davis (AL) Lowey Thompson (MS)
Davis (CA) Maloney Tierney
Davis (FL) Markey Towns
Davis (IL) Matheson Udall (CO)
DeFazio Matsui Udall (NM)
DeGette McCarthy Van Hollen
Delahunt McCollum (MN) Velázquez
DeLauro McDermott Vislosky
Dent McGovern Walden (OR)
Dicks McKinney Wasserman
Dingell Meehan Wasserman
Doggett Meek (FL) Schultz
Edwards Meeks (NY) Waters
Emanuel Menendez Watson
Engel Miller (NC) Watt
Eshoo Miller, George Waxman
Etheridge Moore (KS) Weiner
Evans Moore (WI) Wexler
Farr Moran (VA) Woolsey
Fattah Nadler Wu
Filner Napolitano Wynn

NOES—233

Aderholt Brady (TX) Cuellar
Akin Brown-Waite, Culberson
Alexander Ginny Cunningham
Bachus Burgess Davis (KY)
Baker Burton (IN) Davis (TN)
Barrett (SC) Butterfield Davis, Jo Ann
Bartlett (MD) Calvert Davis, Tom
Barton (TX) Camp Deal (GA)
Beauprez Cannon DeLay
Berry Diaz-Balart, L.
Bilirakis Carter Diaz-Balart, M.
Bishop (UT) Chabot Doolittle
Blackburn Chocola Drake
Blunt Coble Dreier
Boehner Cole (OK) Conaway
Bonilla Conaway Duncan
Bonner Costello Ehlers
Boozman Cox English (PA)
Boren Crenshaw Everett
Boustany Cubin Feeney

Ferguson Lewis (CA)
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Lewis (KY)
 Flake Linder
 Foley Lipinski
 Forbes LoBiondo
 Fortenberry Lucas
 Fossella Lungren, Daniel
 Foxx E.
 Franks (AZ) Lynch
 Gallegly Mack
 Garrett (NJ) Manzullo
 Gerlach Marchant
 Gibbons Marshall
 Gillmor McCaul (TX)
 Gingrey McCotter
 Gohmert McCreery
 Goode McHenry
 Goodlatte McHugh
 Granger McIntyre
 Graves McKeon
 Green (WI) McMorris
 Gutknecht McNulty
 Hall Melancon
 Harris Michaud
 Hart Miller (FL)
 Hayes Miller (MI)
 Hayworth Miller, Gary
 Hefley Mollohan
 Hensarling Moran (KS)
 Herger Murphy
 Hobson Murtha
 Hoekstra Musgrave
 Holden Myrick
 Hostettler Neugebauer
 Hulshof Ney
 Hunter Northup
 Hyde Norwood
 Inglis (SC) Nunes
 Issa Nussle
 Istook Oberstar
 Jenkins Ortiz
 Jindal Osborne
 Johnson (IL) Otter
 Johnson, Sam Oxley
 Jones (NC) Paul
 Kanjorski Pearce
 Keller Pence
 Kennedy (MN) Peterson (MN)
 Kildee Peterson (PA)
 King (IA) Petri
 King (NY) Pickering
 Kingston Pitts
 Kline Platts
 Knollenberg Poe
 Kuhl (NY) Pombo
 LaHood Porter
 Langevin Price (GA)
 Latham Putnam
 LaTourette Radanovich

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (SC) Hastings (WA) Millender-
 Buyer Mica McDonald
 Emerson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1625

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 216 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 216, I inadvertently voted "nay." I meant to vote "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 428, noes 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

AYES—428

Abercrombie Crenshaw
 Ackerman Crowley
 Aderholt Cubin
 Akin Cuellar
 Alexander Culberson
 Allen Cummings
 Andrews Cunningham
 Baca Davis (AL)
 Bachus Davis (CA)
 Baird Davis (FL)
 Baker Davis (LL)
 Baldwin Davis (KY)
 Barrett (SC) Davis (TN)
 Barrow Davis, Jo Ann
 Bartlett (MD) Davis, Tom
 Barton (TX) Deal (GA)
 Bass DeFazio
 Bean DeGette
 Beauprez Delahunt
 Becerra DeLauro
 Berkley DeLay
 Berman Dent
 Berry Diaz-Balart, L.
 Biggert Diaz-Balart, M.
 Bilirakis Dicks
 Bishop (GA) Dingell
 Bishop (NY) Doggett
 Bishop (UT) Doolittle
 Blackburn Doyle
 Blumenauer Drake
 Blunt Dreier
 Boehlert Duncan
 Boehner Edwards
 Bonilla Ehlers
 Bonner Emanuel
 Bono Engel
 Boozman English (PA)
 Boren Eshoo
 Boswell Etheridge
 Boucher Evans
 Boustany Everett
 Boyd Farr
 Bradley (NH) Fattah
 Brady (PA) Feeney
 Brady (TX) Ferguson
 Brown (OH) Filner
 Brown, Corrine Fitzpatrick (PA)
 Brown-Waite, Flake
 Ginny Foley
 Burgess Forbes
 Burton (IN) Ford
 Butterfield Fortenberry
 Buyer Fossella
 Calvert Foxx
 Camp Frank (MA)
 Cannon Franks (AZ)
 Cantor Frelinghuysen
 Capito Gallegly
 Capps Garrett (NJ)
 Capuano Gerlach
 Cardin Gibbons
 Cardoza Gilchrest
 Carnahan Gillmor
 Carson Gingrey
 Carter Gohmert
 Case Gonzalez (CA)
 Castle Goodie
 Chabot Goodlatte
 Chandler Gordon
 Chocola Granger
 Clay Graves
 Cleaver Green (WI)
 Clyburn Green, Al
 Coble Green, Gene
 Cole (OK) Grijalva
 Conaway Gutierrez
 Conyers Gutknecht
 Cooper Hall
 Costa Harman
 Costello Harris
 Cox Hart
 Cramer Hastings (FL)

Matheson Peterson (PA)
 Matsui Petri
 McCarthy Pickering
 McCaul (TX) Pitts
 McCollum (MN) Platts
 McCotter Poe
 McCreery Pombo
 McDermott Pomeroy
 McGovern Porter
 McHenry Price (GA)
 McHugh Price (NC)
 McIntyre Pryce (OH)
 McKeon Putnam
 McKinney Radanovich
 McMorris Rahall
 McNulty Ramstad
 Meehan Rangel
 Meek (FL) Regula
 Meeks (NY) Rehberg
 Melancon Reichert
 Menendez Renzi
 Mica Reyes
 Michaud Reynolds
 Miller (FL) Rogers (AL)
 Miller (MI) Rogers (KY)
 Miller (NC) Rogers (MI)
 Miller, Gary Rohrabacher
 Miller, George Ros-Lehtinen
 Mollohan Ross
 Moore (KS) Rothman
 Moore (WI) Roybal-Allard
 Moran (KS) Royce
 Moran (VA) Ruppertsberger
 Murphy Rush
 Murtha Ryan (OH)
 Musgrave Ryan (WI)
 Myrick Ryun (KS)
 Nadler Sabo
 Napolitano Salazar
 Neal (MA) Sanchez, Linda
 Neugebauer T.
 Ney Sanchez, Loretta
 Northup Sanders
 Norwood Saxton
 Nunes Schakowsky
 Nussle Schiff
 Oberstar Schwartz (PA)
 Obey Schwarz (MI)
 Olver Scott (GA)
 Ortiz Scott (VA)
 Osborne Sensenbrenner
 Otter Serrano
 Owens Sessions
 Oxley Shadegg
 Pallone Shaw
 Pascrell Shays
 Pastor Sherman
 Paul Sherwood
 Payne Shimkus
 Pearce Shuster
 Pelosi Simmons
 Pence Simpson
 Peterson (MN) Skelton

NOES—1

Maloney

NOT VOTING—4

Brown (SC) Hastings (WA) Millender-
 Emerson McDonald

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1632

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 109-96.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

At the end of title V (page 194, after line 11), insert the following new section:

SEC. 6XX. SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES GIVE EQUAL ACCESS TO MILITARY RECRUITERS AND ROTC IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SOLOMON AMENDMENT AND REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program is the most common means for undergraduates to become United States military officers, producing 60 percent of all officers in the Armed Forces and 75 percent of Army officers.

(2) The ROTC program is officially banned from many leading universities and, although students at those institutions can participate in ROTC programs at other colleges, they often have to travel significant distances to do so.

(3) The United States is engaged in a global war on terrorism, and it is thus more important than ever for the Armed Forces to recruit high quality and well-qualified personnel.

(4) Recruiting on university campuses is one of the primary means of obtaining new, highly qualified personnel for the Armed Forces and is an integral, effective, and necessary part of overall military recruitment.

(5) In 1996, Congress enacted a provision of law that has become known as the "Solomon Amendment" that provides for the Secretary of Defense to deny Federal funding to colleges and universities if they prohibit or prevent ROTC or military recruitment on campus.

(6) A group of university law schools have challenged the constitutionality of the Solomon Amendment, and the Supreme Court has agreed to hear the case in the term beginning in October 2005.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) any college or university that discriminates against ROTC programs or military recruiters should be denied certain Federal taxpayer support, especially funding for many military and defense programs; and

(2) universities and colleges that receive Federal funds should provide military recruiters access to college campuses and to college students equal in quality and scope to that provided all other employers.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the colleges and universities that are denying equal access to military recruiters and ROTC programs.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 293, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge all of my colleagues to support this very simple amendment to the Defense authorization bill. This amendment does two very important things.

First, it expresses the sense of Congress that any college or any university that denies equal access or discriminates against ROTC programs or military recruiters should be denied certain Federal taxpayer support, especially funding for many military and defense programs. Secondly, Mr. Chair-

man, it requires the Secretary of Defense to issue a report to Congress on those colleges and universities that are denying equal access to military recruiters and these ROTC programs.

In 1996, Congress enacted a provision of law that became known as the Solomon Amendment. Representative Solomon, as you remember, was a colleague from New York who was chairman of the Committee on Rules. This provision provided for the Secretary of Defense to deny Federal funding to colleges and universities if they prohibited or prevented ROTC or military recruitment on campuses.

Mr. Chairman, a number of universities and colleges today are denying equal access to military recruiters. For example, at Yale University students who wish to participate in the ROTC program must drive to the University of Connecticut in Storrs at least once a week. That is like you and me driving down to Richmond once a week while attending a university here in Washington, D.C. This trip could take up to an hour and a half each way.

Perhaps worse, Yale accepts ROTC dollars, but refuses to grant credit for ROTC courses; so if you are an ROTC scholarship and taking courses at Yale and attending at Storrs, the Air Force, the Army and the Navy will pay for your courses at Yale; but, again, Yale says you have to go to Storrs and denies access to the ROTC program right there at Yale.

While students at Harvard can participate in ROTC programs at nearby MIT, ROTC courses may be taken only on a noncredit basis. This banishment of ROTC led Harvard President Lawrence Summers to say, "We need to be careful about adopting any policy on campus of nonsupport for those involved in defending this country. We should be proud that we have in our midst students who will make the commitment to the ROTC."

This is why it is so important for Congress to make a strong statement in support of full and equal access to military recruiters on campus and for the ROTC.

Therefore, it is vital to national security that we improve the ability of students to simply participate in ROTC programs and ensure that colleges and universities provide military recruiters entry to campuses and simple access to students that is at least equal in quality and scope to that provided by any other employer in America.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I stand in full support of this amendment. ROTC has been an integral part of college life for many, many decades in our country. Land grant colleges across the Nation are required to have ROTC, as they should. But I think those colleges and universities, institutions of higher learning, that have Federal funds flow into them for any number of reasons, any number of grants, for good purposes, of course, should also support the ROTC programs and allow recruiters free access to those that wish to inquire of and join the ROTC.

ROTC is not just a proposition whereby someone may become an officer in the United States Army, Air Force, Navy or Marines. It also is a character builder for young people. They learn about obligations, about duty, about patriotism. I think ROTC has certainly played an important part in so many young lives in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this amendment, and I think it is wrong not to allow ROTC on such campuses.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, although I would note that there are three interests that must be delicately balanced in this instance. The first is the need for our military institutions to have full access to recruit on every campus in the country and to do so in a thorough way; the second interest that has to be balanced is the academic freedom of our colleges and universities to make judgments about what they think should and should not happen on their campuses; and the third interest that has to be balanced is the right of students who are enrolled in ROTC programs, and other students, for that matter, to have a full range of employment options so that if they choose to go into the military, they are not denied that option because of a policy of their college or university.

This is a delicate balance that I think is being properly handled under present law. I would note that the amendment before the body is a sense of Congress resolution. It is one of the reasons I am supporting the amendment. It expresses, I think accurately, the sentiment of the Congress; but it does not disrupt the delicate balance under the law that we presently have today, which I think is wise and prudent.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has voted time and time again to remove obstacles facing some of our military recruiters; and to the credit of most institutions, like those in my home State of Alabama, most do the right thing. Yet a small, but growing, group of institutions just do not seem to get it.

Recently, the University of Wisconsin at Stout joined the exclusive club of liberal institutions that prohibit the military from campus. Instead of doing the right thing and opening their doors to the uniformed personnel, this university has instead chosen to make a narrow-minded political statement.

What the university is doing simply flies in the face of common sense, especially during wartime. For the graduating students, this says clearly that a career in the military is not worth their consideration. Try telling that to the soldiers serving with honor and dignity in Afghanistan and Iraq, or their families praying for their safety.

This practice has got to stop, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important subject. I wholeheartedly support the amendment. While our men and women in uniform are fighting around the world, we have colleges and universities around this country denying equal access to ROTC programs and military recruiters in the name of political correctness.

□ 1645

I would just remind my colleagues of the words of the former Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Krulak, who told us that our "all-volunteer force" is an "all-recruited force." By recruiting the best and the brightest, our United States Armed Forces are today the very best in the world.

We have to stand up for the rights of our recruiters and the rights of our military to gain access to those campuses. Vote for this amendment.

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

With the United States engaged in a global war on terrorism, it is more important than ever before for the Armed Forces to recruit high-quality, well-qualified, and well-trained personnel. This amendment ensures in a larger sense that this Congress is on record saying we support them and we think the universities and colleges in this country should also support them by giving access.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will be postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk designated the amendments en bloc, as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Mr. HUNTER printed in House Report 109-96 consisting of amendment No. 4; amendment No. 5; amendment No. 8; amendment No. 9; amendment No. 11; amendment No. 14; amendment No. 16; amendment No. 17; amendment No. 22; and amendment No. 23.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. STARK

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V (page 194, after line 1), insert the following new section:

SEC. 5xx. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY OF MILITARY RECRUITING.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on military recruiting.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report the following:

(1) Whether military recruitment criminal violations have increased in any branches of the Armed Forces since the beginning of combat in Iraq.

(2) Whether policies of the Department of Defense or of any of the specific military branches have caused or encouraged military recruiters to carry out criminal actions to increase recruitment numbers.

(3) Whether the Department of Justice, Department of Defense, or specific military branches have adequately and independently carried out investigations and prosecutions of all Department of Defense officials who are complicit or directly involved in criminal actions to increase military recruitment.

(4) Any recommendations for any legislation or administrative actions that the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(5) Any other matter the Comptroller General considers relevant.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. STRICKLAND

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V (page 194, after line 11), insert the following new section:

SEC. 5xx. ADDITION OF INFORMATION CONCERNING MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES AND TREATMENT TO SUBJECTS REQUIRED TO BE COVERED IN MANDATORY PRESEPARATION COUNSELING.

Section 1142(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(11) Information concerning the availability of mental health services and the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety disorders, depression, suicidal ideations, or other mental health conditions associated with service in the armed forces."

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V (page 194, after line 11), insert the following new section:

SEC. 5xx. IMPROVEMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULT AFFECTING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an inventory of supplies, trained personnel, and transportation resources assigned or deployed to deal with sexual assault. The Secretary shall assess the availability and accessibility within deployed units of rape evidence kits, testing supplies for sexually transmitted infections and diseases (STIs), including HIV, and for pregnancy, transportation resources, and medication. The assessment shall be completed not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ACTION PLAN FOR DEPLOYED UNITS.—The Secretary shall develop a plan to enhance accessibility and availability of supplies, trained personnel, and transportation resources in response to sexual assaults occurring in deployed units. Such plan shall include the following:

(1) Training of new and existing first responders to sexual assaults, including criminal investigators, medical providers responsible for rape kit evidence collection, and victims advocates, with such training to include current techniques on processing of evidence, including rape kits, and conducting investigations.

(2) Accessibility and availability of supplies for victims of sexual assault who present at a military hospital, including rape kits, equipment for processing rape kits, and testing supplies and treatment for sexually transmitted infections and diseases, including HIV, and pregnancy.

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall include in the annual report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on sexual assaults a report as to the supply inventory, location, accessibility, and availability of supplies, trained personnel, and transportation resources in response to sexual assault in deployed units.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title V (page 194, after line 11), insert the following new section:

SEC. 575. REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT MATTERS FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on difficulties faced by members of the National Guard and Reserve with respect to employment as a result of being ordered to perform full time National Guard duty or being ordered to active duty service, respectively.

(b) SPECIFIC MATTERS.—In preparing the report required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall include information on the following matters

(1) TYPE OF EMPLOYERS.—An estimate of the number of employers of members of the National Guard and Reserve who are private sector employers and those who are public sector employers.

(2) SIZE OF EMPLOYERS.—An estimate of the number of employers of members of the National Guard and Reserve who employ fewer than 50 full-time employees.

(3) SELF-EMPLOYED.—An estimate of the number of members of the National Guard and Reserve who are self-employed.

(4) NATURE OF BUSINESS.—A description of the nature of the business of employers of members of the National Guard and Reserve.

(5) REEMPLOYMENT DIFFICULTIES.—A description of difficulties faced by members of the National Guard and Reserve in gaining reemployment after having performed full time National Guard duty or active duty service, including difficulties faced by members who are disabled and who are Veterans of the Vietnam Era.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. MENENDEZ
The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI (page 279, after line 6), add the following new section:

SEC. 677. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT REGARDING COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS FOR RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General shall prepare a report reviewing the terms and elements of reserve compensation, benefit, and personnel support programs, including the retirement system.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall address at a minimum the following:

(1) The effectiveness and adequacy of compensation and benefit programs, income protection for members of the reserve components called to active duty, family support programs, health care access, and other programs of interest to such members.

(2) The need for these programs to be improved, including such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate for achieving needed improvements.

(3) A comparison of these programs to similar programs conducted for the benefit of regular forces to determine if the reserve programs are fair and equitable given the increased contributions by reserve component forces to the defense of the United States.

(4) An examination of the differences in benefits and protections provided to reservists who are called to serve under different authorities, including title 10, United States Code, title 32, United States Code, and State active duty.

(5) The need for benefits and protections to be made consistent regardless of the authority under which members of the reserve components are called to serve, including such recommendations as the Comptroller General considers appropriate for achieving that objective.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STUDIES AND REPORTS.—To the extent that an issue required to be addressed by subsection (b) is also the subject of other studies or reports being prepared by the Comptroller General, the Comptroller General may drop the issue from this report to avoid duplication of effort.

(d) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit the report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 31, 2006.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF GEORGIA

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VII (page 297, after line 26), add the following new section:

SEC. 718. STUDY RELATING TO PREDEPLOYMENT AND POSTDEPLOYMENT MEDICAL EXAMS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study of the effectiveness of self-administered surveys included in predeployment and postdeployment medical exams of members of the Armed Forces that are carried out as part of the medical tracking system required under section 1074f of title 10, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII (page 321, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 818. PROHIBITION ON DEFENSE CONTRACTORS REQUIRING LICENSES OR FEES FOR USE OF MILITARY LIKENESSES AND DESIGNATIONS.

The Secretary of Defense shall require that any contract entered into by the Department of Defense include a provision prohibiting the contractor from requiring toy and hobby manufacturers, distributors, or merchants to obtain licenses from or pay fees to the contractor for the use of military likenesses or designations on items provided under the contract.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. BLUNT

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII (page 321, after line 7), add the following new section:

SEC. 818. ESTABLISHMENT OF EVALUATION FACTOR FOR DEFENSE CONTRACTORS EMPLOYING OR SUBCONTRACTING WITH MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—In awarding any contract for the procurement of goods or services, the Department of Defense, when considering source selection criteria, shall use as an evaluation factor whether entities intend to carry out the contract using employees or individual subcontractors for goods and services who are members of the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

(b) DOCUMENTATION OF SELECTED RESERVE-RELATED EVALUATION FACTOR.—Any entity claiming intent to carry out a contract using employees or individual subcontractors for goods and services who are members of the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be required to document to the Department of Defense the number (and names, if requested) of such members of the Selected Reserve that the entity will employ, or execute personal services contracts with, for the contract in question.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The Secretary of the military department concerned, or, in the case of contracts which are not negotiated by a military department, the Secretary of Defense, may waive the requirement in subsection (a) with respect to a contract if the Secretary concerned determines that the waiver is necessary for reasons of national security.

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised as necessary to implement this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title X (page 402, after line 22), insert the following new section:

SEC. 10xx. PRESERVATION OF INFORMATION AND RECORDS PERTAINING TO RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT.

(a) PROHIBITION OF DESTRUCTION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense may not destroy any document in the custody or control of the Department of Defense that is a historical record (or part of a historical record) relating to radioactive fallout from the testing of any nuclear device.

(b) PRESERVATION AND PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall identify, preserve, and publish information contained in documents referred to in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR.

HOSSTETTLER

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title X (page 402, after line 22), insert the following new section:

SEC. . . . SPECIAL IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR PERSONS SERVING AS TRANSLATORS WITH UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), subject to subsection (c)(1), the Secretary of Homeland Security may provide an alien described in subsection (b) with the status of a special immigrant under section 101(a)(27) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)), if the alien—

(1) files with the Secretary of Homeland Security a petition under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) for classification under section 203(b)(4) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4)); and

(2) is otherwise eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is otherwise admissible to the United States for permanent residence, except in determining such admissibility, the grounds for inadmissibility specified in section 212(a)(4) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(4)) shall not apply.

(b) ALIENS DESCRIBED.—

(1) PRINCIPAL ALIENS.—An alien is described in this subsection if the alien—

(A) is a national of Iraq or Afghanistan;

(B) worked directly with United States Armed Forces as a translator for a period of at least 12 months;

(C) obtained a favorable written recommendation from the first general or flag officer in the chain of command of the United States Armed Forces unit that was supported by the alien; and

(D) prior to filing the petition described in subsection (a)(1), cleared a background check and screening, as determined by the first general or flag officer in the chain of command of the United States Armed Forces unit that was supported by the alien.

(2) SPOUSES AND CHILDREN.—An alien is described in this subsection if the alien is the spouse or child of a principal alien described in paragraph (1), and is following or accompanying to join the principal alien.

(c) NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The total number of principal aliens who may be provided special immigrant status under this section during any fiscal year shall not exceed 50.

(2) COUNTING AGAINST SPECIAL IMMIGRANT CAP.—For purposes of the application of sections 201 through 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151–1153) in any fiscal year, aliens eligible to be provided status under this section shall be treated as special immigrants described in section 101(a)(27) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)) who are not described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (K) of such section.

(d) APPLICATION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT PROVISIONS.—The definitions in subsections (a) and (b) of section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101) shall apply in the administration of this section.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 16 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and printed in House Report 109–96 be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII (page 321, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 818. PROHIBITION ON DEFENSE CONTRACTORS REQUIRING LICENSES OR FEES FOR USE OF MILITARY LIKENESSES AND DESIGNATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall require that any contract entered into by the Department of Defense include a provision prohibiting the contractor from requiring toy and hobby manufacturers, distributors, or merchants to obtain licenses from or pay fees to the contractor for the use of military likenesses or designations on items provided under the contract.

(b) LIMITATION TO UNITED STATES COMPANIES.—Subsection (a) applies only with respect to toy and hobby manufacturers, distributors, or merchants incorporated in or organized under the laws of the United States.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is modified.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 293, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, we are gathering our speakers, and I would hope my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) would be able to lead off with his speakers, so I reserve my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, over the past 15 to 20 years, there has been a major and fundamental change in the way that our Reserve component has been used. Historically, National Guardsmen and Reservists were primarily viewed as a force expansion that could be used to supplement our active duty troops at times of a major war or conflict. But today these forces not only support our active forces, they also replace them in operations around the world.

Since September 11, a large number of our Reserve component has been called to active duty, and the pace of Reserve per tempo is very high and expected to remain that way for the foreseeable future. In fact, as of May 20, we had over 162,000 National Guard members and Reservists on active duty both here at home and around the world.

Unfortunately, there have been a variety of reports detailing recruiting

and retention problems that our Armed Forces have experienced over the last year. Clearly, if our Nation continues to rely more and more on National Guard members and Reservists without providing them and their families the support they need at home, we risk establishing a pattern of failure when it comes to meeting the recruitment and retention targets.

That is why I am very happy that we have included this amendment as part of the en bloc, and I appreciate the chairman's and the ranking member's help in doing so.

In September of 2003, the GAO found that the DOD lacked sufficient information and data to address financial and health care issues affecting Reservists and their families. Fortunately, there is new information that could be used to determine the effect on readiness, recruiting, retention and, yes, on these families.

Both a CBO study and a DOD survey, which were recently completed, have some interesting facts: 56 percent of National Guard members and Reservists are married; 55 percent of married Guard members and Reservists report a loss of income over their civilian jobs; 15 percent of those Guard members and Reservists report a pay decrease of \$30,000 a year; and 71 percent of them cite family burdens as a reason to leave the military.

For all of those reasons, I am happy to see that our amendment, which will have a GAO report to provide recommendations to the Congress on how these programs can be improved to treat more fairly our Guardsmen, our Reservists, and their families, will be a reality.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment to H.R. 1815 and in support of my "Healthy Troops" amendment contained therein.

Mr. Chairman, I first introduced the Healthy Troops Act when it was brought to my attention that many of our men and women serving in harm's way are not receiving hands-on medical examinations before or after they are deployed in combat. A 1997 congressional mandate requires both pre- and post-deployment medical exams, but this requirement is currently being met by the DOD by having our troops fill out self-administered questionnaires.

This concerns me, as I believe it should concern all Americans, first, because the health of our servicemembers should not rely on their ability to self-diagnose; and secondly, because these brave men and women deserve an accurate documentation of their health status in combat so that, if necessary, they can claim veterans' health benefits when they come home.

My original amendment required that DOD provide full hands-on and

pre- and post-deployment exams for all deployed troops as opposed to the self-administered questionnaires. It also mandated a study of the effectiveness of the self-administered exams.

The revised amendment, which reflects a bipartisan compromise struck with the chairman and the committee, provides only for the study into the effectiveness of the questionnaires and that the study be performed within 120 days of enactment.

I do not believe that this is enough, but it does represent a victory for our servicemembers, men and women because, one, it continues an important, ongoing dialogue on the health and safety of our servicemen and -women, and two, because it requires further analysis of the effectiveness of the actual hands-on health screens.

I think that we can all agree that the health of servicemembers must be at the top of our agenda. This amendment puts the focus where it belongs.

I urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) for yielding me this time and for the work he has done on this bill.

In the en bloc amendment, really several of the provisions of a bill that I introduced recently, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and others, to try to address the concerns that we have and, I think, concerns that are shared by not only the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Ranking Member SKELTON), but many of the Members of this Congress, on people who serve in the National Guard and Reserves.

We see declining recruitment numbers. Clearly, the service, and the Guard and Reserves is a service where people who often have already served full-time in the military are willing to be available to the country in time of crisis, in times of imminent need; but people who were joining the Guard and Reserve, until recent years, until the last decade, at least, did not expect to be joining the Guard and Reserve to effectively be serving in the full-time force.

I believe in an integrated armed service. I believe in the importance of a full-time force that is no bigger than it needs to be, to be supplemented in times of crisis by the great skills of people who either have served in the full-time force or who have received their training in the Guard and the Reserve.

The Army is more than halfway through its fiscal year with only 33,000 soldiers signed up, and is certainly likely to miss the target of 80,000 for 2005. That sort of recruiting puts more pressure on the Guard and Reserve. For 3 consecutive months, the Army has been short of its goal; and the Marines,

that traditionally meet their goals, have not met their monthly goal this entire year. So we need to be concerned about the use of the full-time force and, obviously, the impact that has on the Guard and Reserve that are available.

Legislation from our bill will be included in this en bloc amendment. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is joining me in proposing this amendment, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) will bring other amendments from our bill to the floor.

In the amendment that I am speaking in favor of, this is an amendment that just simply would allow and encourage the Department of Defense to take into account National Guard and Reserve personnel as one of the items that they would look at when they evaluate a bid for DOD work.

I had a specific instance in my district in the last year where a business that had a government repair contract, that had a significant number of Guardsmen, in fact, those Guardsmen had been called up; and while those Guardsmen were called up, the work that they had been doing was given, in competitive bidding, no doubt, but given in competitive bidding to a Canadian company. Nobody in that Canadian company was serving in Iraq at the time for reasons we all understand.

We would like to see that taken into account as these contracts are evaluated and look for other ways that the military can do things to further support our Guardsmen and Reservists.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to thank the gentleman for his amendment.

There is nothing more important for our returning Guardsmen and Reservists than to know that they have a good job, and the idea of directing some of this money, the massive amount is \$441 billion, that we pass in this bill goes to not only pay for people, but also to pay for the products that are used in the defense apparatus; to make sure that that is, as much as possible, those products are made by Americans. And made by Americans who are serving this flag should be a priority for our country.

So I can assure the gentleman, we will be happy to continue to work on this as it moves through the process.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I really appreciate the chairman's understanding of this problem and his commitment to this problem.

The other thing that we need to be doing is to ensure that Guardsmen and Reservists do have jobs when they come back; and if that job is a government contract, we should be doing everything we can to ensure that their service is noted in awarding the extension of that contract.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, before I recognize the gentleman from Utah, let me say I wish to compliment my

fellow Missourian on his amendment. The Guard and Reserve mean very much to us, and I think it is a major step in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHE-SON).

□ 1700

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this en bloc amendment to the Defense bill.

I have offered an amendment to the bill that would require the Department of Defense to preserve irreplaceable historical records related to radioactive fallout, and I am pleased this amendment was ruled in order and is part of this en bloc amendment.

Now currently the Department of Energy has ordered a moratorium on the destruction of such records, but the Department of Defense has no such prohibition and relevant records could potentially be lost.

The National Academy of Sciences has pointed out that both the Navy and the Air Force have important documents that should be archived.

As a result, the National Academy urged Congress to require better preservation of historical data related to radioactive fallout records.

That is exactly what this amendment does.

My amendment prohibits the Department of Defense from destroying these historical records and directs the Department to identify, preserve, and publish information contained in these records.

Atmospheric testing was a dark period in our history for many Americans. We should do whatever we can to preserve the limited records from that time so they remain viable for scientific study. With this amendment we are taking a good first step toward preserving history.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman especially for his inclusion of major parts of the Americans in Uniform Act authored by the majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), in this legislation.

One amendment in particular would allow the Defense Department to review the record of a contractor in retaining and keeping Reservists. Now, we have had a case in which some employers are so good at keeping Reservists that they have got a number of positions missing; and then they have failed to get a new contract award and providing material to the Department of Defense, and contracts have even gone to other companies in other countries that have no such Reserve obligation. That is wrong.

This amendment says that the Department of Defense at least will be able to look at the record of contractors in keeping Americans in uniform when they make new awards. And that means a signal will go throughout the

business community that you should be a good employer of Reservists.

We have had over 400,000 Americans called to active duty. I stand here as, I think, the only Member of Congress still regularly drilling in the Reserves. I have got duty this weekend. And when I talk to my fellow Americans in uniform, there are unique pressures on the Reserves. But we are proud. We are proud to wear the uniform. We are proud to take part in what we need to do in the war on terror. And we are proud to stand with other leaders, like my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), that have done so much to make it easier for Reservists to keep their jobs.

When you look at the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), sheriff, now Congressman, and what he did as a good employer of making sure that Reservists, when they go on active duty, do not suffer a loss in pay, it is what every employer should do in America; but sadly some do not. And we need to change that. This set of reforms in this legislation under the Americans in Uniform Act, the Blunt legislation, help do that, on the Space-A reforms of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS), on the study in which we are going to see exactly what we need to do for Reservists under the Reichert legislation and under the Blunt/Larsen/Kirk reforms that make DOD contractors report on how they are taking care of our Americans in uniform, and to know that it will be considered in the award of contracts sends a powerful signal that the all-volunteer military is working, that the total force is working, and that we look on these Americans who wear the uniform part-time, in Winston Churchill's eyes, as twice a citizen, as someone who is a good member of their community, but when the country calls they respond exactly when we need them to go into harm's way and to be on the frontier of freedom.

And, Mr. Chairman, thank you so much for including these reforms in the Americans for Uniform Act.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I also want to stand in support of the Blunt/Kirk amendment to the Defense Authorization Act.

Today our Guard and Reserve are protecting our security abroad. And, frankly, it is Congress's job and responsibility to create a network of job security when they come home. That is why I support this amendment.

Our Guard and Reserve are over-extended. Their Nation has called on them to serve. In most cases they have left a place of employment to do so, and Congress has a responsibility to ensure that we do not create any barriers for our Guard and Reserve that would keep them from returning to those jobs.

This amendment will help ensure that if you are a member of the National Guard Or Reserve you will not

be at a disadvantage if working on a DOD contract through your employment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will push the DOD to consider the employment of Guard and Reserve members when they award contracts. When serving, these women and men of the Guard and Reserve protect this Nation. This amendment gives us one more way that we can protect these brave women and men and their families when they come home.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I too am proud to be a part of today's process and ensuring that our National Guardsmen and -women and Reservists are respected and we are showing them that we have listened to their concerns.

I have served in the Air Force Reserves, and I will not tell you how long ago that exactly was. But let us just say that my pay at that time was as a police officer around \$700 to \$800 a month. So it was awhile ago.

When I was on duty as a Reservist, I took a pay cut. And that was a cut from \$700 a month. So you can imagine that it was a little bit hard to keep your family supported during that period of time. And I know what it is like to be a Reservist. I had a financial responsibility. I had employment issues. And it is not easy to juggle those weighty concerns while preparing to serve your country or as soon as you return.

When I was sheriff of King County, we developed a standard to support our employees who were also Reserve soldiers. Their jobs were guaranteed no matter what length of time they served or how long their tour of duty was. The soldiers knew that when they came back they had a job, they had employment, and that they were supported 100 percent. Men and women serving our country should be praised, not punished for being guardians of our Flag.

During the last recess, I had the honor of sitting down with 20 National Guard soldiers who had just returned from Iraq. In the 2 hours I spent with them, we discussed a number of concerns. But the issue reiterated by nearly every soldier in attendance was employment.

That is why I am offering an amendment today to commission a study requiring the GAO to report on employment matters for the National Guard and Reserve, in particular the difficulties faced by soldiers in gaining reemployment once they return from duty.

It is important that we know what types of jobs our servicemembers hold so we can address their employment issues. Our National Guard and Reserves are an incredibly important part of our military; and we need to protect their interests, protect their families, protect their jobs, and make sure that they are respected for their service.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment which includes my amendment regarding VA mental health services. My amendment will make sure that soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan know about the mental health services available to them by requiring that they be fully informed of these services when separating from active duty.

Our men and women are returning from deployments with very high rates of mental and emotional disorders. And as we know, there is often a stigma regarding mental health treatment, especially in the military. That is why we need to clearly communicate to our returning troops that they are entitled to receive help in dealing with problems resulting from their service to our country. Whether they are struggling with PTSD, depression or any other mental disorder, there is treatment available for them at our VA facilities. My amendment would simply require that those mental health treatment options are presented to our soldiers so that they can make informed decisions as they return to civilian life.

I appreciate that this amendment was made in order, and I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment. Our men and women are bearing great physical and mental burdens from the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The very least we can do is to inform them of the benefits they have earned.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), in a colloquy.

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

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask for the gentleman's help to make military golf courses accessible with specialty golf carts for veterans community and disabled golf patrons. Our Nation's disabled military personnel and veterans have paid a great debt to their country. We have an obligation to make their reintegration into society as seamless as possible, and one way is to make it easier for them to resume recreational activities like golf.

And I would ask the chairman if he would agree that the committee should explore the feasibility of the cost of providing specialty carts for disabled golf patrons at military golf courses with DOD and the services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my colleague, I think he has brought a great idea forward. We have military bases around the country that serve not only the active duty folks, but also retired folks and disabled folks; and it seems absolutely appropriate that we make sure that those

golf courses, all of which have electric golf carts, have some specialty carts to accommodate those who need them. So I will work with the gentleman, and let us see if we can make sure that there are enough carts available at all the courses to accommodate all the folks that need them.

Mr. FARR. I thank the chairman. I look forward to working with the gentleman.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), for a bill that is probably one of the more important initiatives that this Congress addresses, and that is the ordering and the governance of the United States Military, particularly this week that we honor those fallen heroes.

Might I also say, however, that I wish appropriately that this legislation had the fullness of opportunity for many of us to debate. I am reminded that times before this legislation was debated for 2 weeks because it is so important and so crucial for the men and women of the United States military.

I rise in support of an amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), which I am a cosponsor of. I was a cosponsor of that bill, and this was an amendment that was taken from H.R. 2293. I continue to support it. It would provide special immigrant status for a limited number of Iraqis and Afghans who have served as translators for the U.S. armed services.

The translators are providing services for our combat forces in Iraq. And according to the Marines who work with them, the translators and their immediate families live in constant danger of debt because of the key support they are providing for our combat forces. The Marine commanders have expressed a desire to help them come to the U.S. with their immediate families, and we wanted to answer their call. The commanders believe that the lives of the translators will be in even jeopardy when the Marines withdraw from Iraq.

The translators have gone far beyond just providing translation services. They stay with the Marines in their camps, in the same living quarters, and eat chow with the soldiers every day.

I am reminded of the individual who helped translate and ultimately found Saddam Hussein. He now is a citizen of the United States, was previously so, but has the ability to come here and he is provided safety for him and his family.

The amendment would make permanent resident visas available to the nationals of Iraq and Afghanistan and

their spouses and children who have helped the U.S. in this most difficult effort. And so I would ask my colleagues to support this.

As I rise to honor these individuals, might I also say that we need to honor the fallen dead who come home to our shores and allow them to be honored when these soldiers return home. And I hope that we will look forward to removing the executive order that requires lights out when our fallen heroes have come back having served in the United States military, and having lost their lives in battle.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the Hostettler/Jackson-Lee amendment.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HOSTETTLER. I was a co-sponsor of the bill that this amendment was taken from, H.R. 2293, and I continue to support it in its present form. It would provide special immigrant status for a limited number of Iraqis and Afghani who have served as translators for the U.S. Armed Forces.

The translators are providing services for our combat forces in Iraq. According to the Marines who work with them, the translators and their immediate families live in constant danger of death because of the key support they are providing for our combat forces. The Marine commanders have expressed a desire to help them to come to the U.S. with their immediate families. The commanders believe that the lives of the translators will be in even greater jeopardy when the Marines withdraw from Iraq.

The translators have gone far beyond just providing translation services. They stay with the Marines in their camp, in the same living quarters, and eat chow with the soldiers every day. They go into the field with the Marines. They have fought along side of them and shed blood with them during combat operations. Some of the Marines feel so strongly about helping the translators that they have offered to take them into their homes in the United States until they have had enough time to settle in and find places of their own.

The amendment would make permanent resident visas available to nationals of Iraq and Afghanistan (and their spouses and minor children) who have worked directly with U.S. Armed Forces as translators for at least 12 months, who have obtained favorable written recommendations from the officer in charge of the unit they worked with, and who have cleared a background check. No more than 50 principals would be eligible to receive permanent resident status. The recipients would count towards the 10,000-per-year quota of special immigrant visas.

I am pleased that we can offer permanent resident status to such deserving immigrants with a bipartisan bill. I urge you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, the en bloc amendment calls among other things for special immigrant status for Iraqi or Afghani nationals who have served as translators with the United States Armed Forces. This amendment is a direct response to the critical need

for translators and linguists in our military. This interpreter shortage is well documented. The 9/11 Commission report stated that the government "lacked sufficient translators proficient in Arabic and other key languages, resulting in a significant backlog of untranslated intercepts."

The 2002 GAO study and the September 2004 Justice Department IG report made the same findings. The shortage of Arabic translators in Iraq and Afghanistan has made it harder for U.S. soldiers to protect themselves and has jeopardized interrogations of suspected al Qaeda terrorists in U.S. custody.

□ 1715

I commend the author of this legislation for his willingness to open the immigration doors to Arabic and Farsi linguists serving as translators with the United States Armed Forces. Yet, the answer to this dire need is not to give U.S. citizenship to Iraqis and Afghans, but rather to stop discriminating against American citizens who are ready to loyally serve their country as Arabic translators.

It is no coincidence that this bill would create 50 spots for Iraqi and Afghani nationals, almost the exact number of translators who have been discharged under the military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" law in effect since 1994. Fifty-four Arabic and nine Persian/Iranian, including Farsi, translators have been discharged under this policy.

Because of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," the military continues to devote its resources to rooting out patriotic gay Americans whose service is central to the war on terrorism. This is another example of how "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" is not in the best interest of our national security.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress says, "Don't ask, Don't tell, Don't translate."

I urge my colleagues to recognize the fundamental rights of American citizens and the fundamental absurdity of denying the right to serve to citizens who have vitally needed skills that we all know we need.

I urge this Congress to repeal the obnoxious and incredibly self-defeating policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and to the members of the staff for including in this en bloc amendment a proposal with respect to the retailers and distributors of model airplanes and model ships.

One way to express your patriotism and support for the military is to collect and assemble and build models of military craft and military vehicles. An unfortunate occurrence has happened in the last few years where the large defense contractors which received the right to build these materials are extracting royalties from the consumers who buy them. They extract those royalties from the distributors and the retailers. We would like to stop that practice.

These ships and planes are designed with public money. They are conceived of with public money, and we do not think the American public should pay for this twice.

I very much appreciate the fact that language that takes us in that direction has been included in the bill. Frankly, there is more work to do in my judgment concerning who is covered by the scope of the language but this is an important first step. It will promote patriotism for those who collect and build these models, and it will do so in a fair way to the consumer.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the staffs for making this possible.

I would ask for support of the en bloc amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take 2 minutes, but I just wanted to say that in committee the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) introduced this amendment. I thought it was an excellent amendment and that we ought to follow through on it.

We had a problem in committee that it might have a jurisdictional problem. The gentleman was nice enough to agree to withdraw it so we could check that jurisdictional problem. We do not have that problem at this point.

The gentleman is on the right track. It ought to be passed. I am glad it is in the en bloc, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention.

I do not think most of us who grew up with the thrill of playing with model airplanes ever dreamed that this was the situation, and this will correct the situation. I appreciate the gentleman doing that.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have talked about the translator provision that would give some accommodation to those folks who have served our U.S. military in those warfighting theaters, and I just wanted to give some credit for the originator of this proposal. It was a Marine captain in Fallujah who talked about the service of these translators, how much they risk, the exposure that they take, and the dedication that they have to America and to our cause. So it was that recommendation that found its way back to the floor of the House, and I am glad that we are passing it.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who have spoken in favor of this provision.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this defense authorization bill. Once again, the Republican majority has pushed forward a defense budget that does nothing to make this country any safer.

This bill continues Congress' long-held tradition of throwing away billions on the development of ineffective or duplicative weapons systems that pad the pockets of big defense contractors. It authorizes \$7.9 billion on pie-in-the-sky Star Wars missile defense, a \$100 million increase over President Bush's request. Yet, this unproven Cold War concept does not address the very real security threat posed by weapons of significant magnitude that are readily delivered in a suitcase or cargo container.

Developing new nuclear weapons, as this bill encourages, will not deter terrorists or rogue nations like North Korea. It encourages them to answer in kind, especially as the Bush Administration pursues its belligerent policy of preemption.

Further, as long as the United States is in Iraq, the Iraqi insurgency will continue to have a justification to carry out their savage attacks on the Iraqi people and security forces and American soldiers. It is unfortunate the Republican majority continues to believe that throwing more money at the problems in Iraq will somehow slow death rates.

Over 1,500 young Americans and more than 20,000 Iraqi civilians have been killed; the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq is necessary if the United States is serious about bringing peace and security to the Iraqi people.

Whether or not those soldiers currently fighting overseas are active duty, National Guard or reserves, they all deserve the same access to health care. Unfortunately, this bill once again shortchanges our troops. The Chairman of the Armed Services Committee unilaterally stripped out language in the bill that provided the same health care to our National Guard members and reservists as the rest of our soldiers. President Bush's war in Iraq has leaned heavily on National Guard members and reservists. It is only fair that we provide them—and their family members—the same health care as the rest of our soldiers; their sacrifice has been no less.

The American people may be surprised to know that even a defense bill can be used to advance the agenda of the religious right. An amendment to allow servicewomen to use their own funds to obtain an abortion at an overseas U.S. military medical facility was beaten back by conservatives who continue to prove they vote first, and think second.

How can we ask our women in uniform to fight abroad for the rights of others, when we prevent them from exercising their own constitutional right to choose?

I urge my colleagues to vote down this wasteful and irresponsible bill. It is time we had a defense budget that lives within its means, accounts for what is truly required in Iraq, and provides the best possible support for all our troops. Nor does it alleviate years of Defense Department policies that discriminate against sexual orientation and gender.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to offer this very important amendment that will help the

Department of Defense improve their capability to provide care to victims of sexual assault in the military.

Earlier this month, the Department of Defense released their first annual report to Congress on sexual assault in the military. And the findings were not good. Of the 1,275 cases of sexual assault among service members, only 113 cases resulted in a court martial.

More discouraging is the fact that 278 cases were not pursued because the perpetrator could not be identified. And, another 351 cases were not pursued because of unsubstantiated or insufficient evidence. Mr. Chairman, this amounts to 629 sexual assault cases, nearly 50 percent of those reported, where the perpetrator is still out there, free to commit further assaults on our brave service women defending our country.

Surely the Department of Defense can and needs to do a better job of training new and existing first responders to respond to sexual assaults occurring in the military. Criminal investigators, medical professionals, and victims advocates all need to be trained on gathering, protecting, and processing evidence.

The Defense Department must do a better job of providing the best possible care for service women who are victims of sexual assault. And that is what my amendment will do.

Last March, servicewomen spoke before the Congressional Women's Caucus about the inability of some military healthcare facilities to appropriately care for women who had been sexually assaulted. In some areas, medical providers are not familiar with the gathering and processing of rape kits. More dismaying, some facilities are not even equipped with rape kits. With great emotion, these service women recounted the military's failure to provide them with a private examination or tests for pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow women to be victimized once by their perpetrator and then again by the lack of appropriate, compassionate care at military healthcare facilities.

My amendment seeks to prevent our women in uniform from experiencing this egregious treatment. It requires the Secretary of Defense to assess the training and resource gaps, which have prevented victims of sexual assault in the military from receiving the best possible care. Based on this assessment, my amendment also requires the Secretary to develop a plan to address these gaps by enhancing the accessibility and availability of supplies and trained personnel by military victims of sexual assault.

It is my hope that through this plan the Secretary will require military healthcare facilities to carry emergency contraception (EC). Although emergency contraception has been available in the U.S. by prescription since the late 1990s, it is not available to U.S. servicewomen. EC is widely recognized as an integral part of comprehensive and compassionate emergency treatment for sexual assault survivors. We do a disservice to women in the military by not requiring EC be available to them after a sexual assault.

Women in the service put themselves in harms way to protect us and our Nation from threats at home and abroad. The least we can do is ensure they are protected when facing a horrible tragedy. My amendment helps the Defense Department provide military victims of

sexual assault with honor, respect, and the best possible care that they deserve.

I urge everyone to support my amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, when a woman enlists in the military to serve her country honorably, she expects that the resources will be there to take care of her in the unfortunate tragedy of rape. But a recent report from the Miles Foundation revealed that three fourths of the female veterans who were raped did not report the incident to a ranking officer. One third didn't know how to; and one fifth believed that rape was to be expected in the military. Even if they had reported the incident, if the service woman who had been sexually assaulted seeks care at a military healthcare facility, she may not be granted a private examination or tests for pregnancy and STIS. This is an outrageous way to treat our female military volunteers. That's why I urge my colleagues to support the Slaughter amendment, which would assure that our service women have access to the medical care and evaluation that they need when this type of strategy strikes. We owe them no less.

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Washington on this amendment. It is important to evaluate and understand the financial difficulties that citizen-soldiers face when called to serve their country.

Over 400,000 citizen-soldiers have been mobilized since September 11, 2001. This is the largest activation of National Guard and Reserve members since World War II and will likely continue for the immediate future. About half of our total military are National Guard and Reserve forces.

Recent government studies show that 40 percent of them make less money while mobilized than they earn in their civilian jobs. To solve this pay problem, I have introduced H.R. 838, which would offer employers a tax credit to help make up some of the pay gap.

Military Reservists and Guardsmen unselfishly answer the call to serve and protect their country at a moment's notice, many times at a personal and financial cost. In turn, we need to show appreciation and support for their patriotic efforts.

We ask a lot of those who serve the cause of American freedom. Financial ruin should not be one of those sacrifices.

I commend the gentleman for his work on behalf of our Guard and Reservists and urge passage of this amendment.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 109-96.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BRADLEY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire:

At the end of subtitle C of title XXVIII, insert the following new section:

SEC. 28 . POSTPONEMENT OF 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.

(a) **POSTPONEMENT.**—The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-09510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 2915. POSTPONEMENT OF 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the round of defense base closure and realignment otherwise scheduled to occur under this part in 2005 by reasons of sections 2912, 2913, and 2914 shall occur instead in the year following the year in which the last of the actions described in subsection (b) occurs (in this section referred to as the ‘postponed closure round year’).

“(b) **ACTIONS REQUIRED BEFORE BASE CLOSURE ROUND.**—(1) The actions referred to in subsection (a) are the following actions:

“(A) The complete analysis, consideration, and, where appropriate, implementation by the Secretary of Defense of the recommendations of the Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States.

“(B) The return from deployment in the Iraq theater of operations of substantially all (as determined by the Secretary of Defense) major combat units and assets of the Armed Forces.

“(C) The receipt by the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the report on the quadrennial defense review required to be submitted in 2006 by the Secretary of Defense under section 118(d) of title 10, United States Code.

“(D) The complete development and implementation by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security of the National Maritime Security Strategy.

“(E) The complete development and implementation by the Secretary of Defense of the Homeland Defense and Civil Support directive.

“(F) The receipt by the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives of a report submitted by the Secretary of Defense that assesses military installation needs taking into account—

“(i) relevant factors identified through the recommendations of the Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States;

“(ii) the return of the major combat units and assets described in subparagraph (B);

“(iii) relevant factors identified in the report on the 2005 quadrennial defense review;

“(iv) the National Maritime Security Strategy; and

“(v) the Homeland Defense and Civil Support directive.

“(2) The report required under subparagraph (F) of paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than one year after the occurrence of the last action described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of such paragraph.

“(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—For purposes of sections 2912, 2913, and 2914, each date in a year that is specified in such sections shall be deemed to be the same date in the postponed closure round year, and each reference to a fiscal year in such sections shall be deemed to be a reference to the fiscal year that is the number of years after the original fiscal year that is equal to the number of years that the postponed closure round year is after 2005.”.

(b) **INEFFECTIVENESS OF 2005 ROUND OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT.**—Effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act, any list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment submitted to Congress pursuant to section 2914 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 shall have no further force and effect.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 293, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me start out by thanking the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON); the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY); the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER); and all of the members of the House Committee on Armed Services for the defense of our Nation and for working so hard for our troops.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) are indeed fine leaders and it is a pleasure to serve under them in the bipartisan fashion that they conduct the committee business.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain this amendment because the sponsors believe that this amendment is critical to our Nation's defense. It postpones the base realignment and closure process until 1 year after a number of studies are completed and until 1 year after the troops have returned home from the Iraqi theater.

The studies in question, number one, the Overseas Base Commission Report, which was released on May 9, 4 days before the BRAC list came out, what of the 70,000 troops that are slated to return to our country and the 30,000 new troops that we have authorized? Where will they be housed, on what bases? Where will the children of these troops go to school? What are the MILCON expenditures likely to be that we have to appropriate? We need to have those answers.

We also need the Quadrennial Defense Review, the potential threats that our Nation faces, the force structure, the defense infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the last QDR was completed on September 30 of 2001, so the Department of Defense is using outdated information, information that predates Iraq, predates the hostility in Afghanistan, predates the war on terror. The next QDR is slated to be completed this fall, too late for the BRAC Commission's report.

Other studies that are necessary are the National Marine Security Strategy Study by the Department of Defense, as well as the Secretary's report assessing our Nation's military installation needs.

Mr. Speaker, let us be extremely careful before closing 33 major bases and hundreds of smaller facilities that we have not undermined through the base closure process the security of our Nation.

This amendment ensures that we exercise that necessary care and necessary restraint so important to the security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for his leadership on this important issue.

I rise today in support of this amendment, delaying the implementation of the BRAC recommendation, because it is clear that we need to slow this process down. Given the broad range of uncertainties surrounding our overall military infrastructure and operations, now is not the time to be shutting down domestic military installations. There are serious questions that need to be answered first.

We have more than 120,000 soldiers currently deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are planning to realign our overseas bases. We are less than 1 year away from completing a comprehensive Quadrennial Defense Review. There are simply too many moving parts and too many unanswered questions right now to complete this domestic BRAC round end process on the currently prescribed schedule and close bases here at home.

Simply put, we need to slow the process down to ensure we do not make critical mistakes when we are deciding our national security and military strategy. These are decisions that we should make with all available information and we are nowhere near having all of the necessary information.

Ellsworth Air Force Base in Rapid City, South Dakota, is my State's second largest employer and an integral part of our national defense as home to the 28th Bomb Wing and the B-1 Bomber. It is also scheduled for closure, along with 32 other major installations across the country. Now, inexcusably, we have yet to receive complete information regarding the criteria and the reasons for the Department of Defense's recommendations. This is true of many other installations in affected communities.

Site visits by BRAC commissioners are already under way. We are only weeks away from the commission holding regional hearings, including one in Rapid City to discuss the DOD's recommendations. But neither they nor we have received the complete information that was used to make those recommendations.

That fact alone is evidence that there is not adequate time built into this process and ample reason to slow the process down.

I respectfully request every one of my colleagues, regardless of how your district may have been affected by DOD's recommendations, to support

this important amendment for our national security and for essential fairness in the process.

Is postponing this BRAC round a reasonable action in light of the fact that we as Members of Congress and every member of the commission lacks the information that we have identified here today, lacks the information underlying the DOD's analysis in their decisions? The obvious answer to that question is "yes," it is a reasonable action. And the obvious vote on this amendment is a "yes" vote.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), a very active and thoughtful member of the Subcommittee on Readiness of the Committee on Armed Services, for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

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

Over the past several years many Members of this body, including myself, have tried to delay or cancel the 2005 Base Closure Realignment and Closure round. Last year, in fact for a couple of years, the House has actually passed something to do that. And last year in the Defense act we passed a 2-year delay which would have required very much similar types of reports and so forth, which we thought was a very reasonable approach to give us more evidence to base our decision on.

I think the approach the gentleman makes today is a very reasonable approach. And I had hopes that last year we could delay the process because it did not seem to me to be the time for a base closure round, and I used many of the same reasons that the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) does. But I do think that last year was the last chance to delay BRAC.

Unfortunately, we faced a veto threat from the President and opposition from the other body, and in the conference committee what we passed here in the House disappeared. And as I said, I think it is too late now. The Secretary of Defense has made recommendations for the base realignments and closures.

The BRAC Commission has been appointed and has begun review of BRAC data. The Commission has held hearings. I think today they started their visits to bases around the Nation. And as the old cliché says, "The train has left the station." I think it is very difficult to call that train back at this stage.

BRAC is a carefully crafted process. It was designed in time to ensure that base closures are made in a fair and nonpartisan manner. The process al-

lows for Congress to disapprove the final BRAC recommendations. And while I recognize that disapproving the recommendations is a difficult hurdle to clear, that is our best remaining opportunity to terminate the BRAC process.

The Bradley amendment before us today may be tempting to anybody who has a military installation in or near their district. Those who dodged the bullet fired by the DOD's BRAC recommendations are still at risk of being placed on a closure or realignment list by the Commission. Those who were not so fortunate face a very difficult task in trying to convince the BRAC Commission to remove their bases from the closure and reassignment list.

□ 1730

However, those tempted to support this amendment should know that it does have some problems.

First, the amendment would terminate all that has already occurred and would restart the BRAC process at some undetermined time out in the future. For communities not on the DOD's BRAC list, this amendment would reset the process and put them through years, perhaps, of worry that DOD might change its mind. For communities on DOD's BRAC list, the Bradley amendment may spare them temporarily, but they would face the likelihood and perception that DOD is likely to reach the same closure and realignment conclusions when the round recommenced in the future. Such a stigma would leave those communities in a state of limbo.

Can any of us imagine businesses investing money into a community around a base they almost are sure or know will be closed or realigned, but that lacks a redevelopment plan? For such communities, the sooner BRAC is complete, the sooner they will be able to redevelop and attract new businesses and commerce.

Secondly, the Bradley amendment would postpone BRAC until some unknown period in the future. According to the amendment, BRAC would restart 1 year after a number of items are completed, including the quadrennial defense review and the withdrawal of substantially all major combat units and assets from Iraq.

Not only would this rolling delay leave all of our communities without any clarity when the next BRAC round will occur, but it means the next BRAC round could occur during an election year. We tried to get away from that because of the partisanship of it. Those that built the 2005 round of BRAC timed it carefully to ensure that Presidential politics or even congressional politics for that matter do not drive the process. So the timing would be a problem, perhaps.

On a final note, the Bradley amendment is effectively dead on arrival, unfortunately. The administration threatened to veto the bill 2 years ago,

and I am sure that threat will come about again. I do not think the Senate is in a mood to change its mind, although that may have changed because of the recommendations that were made.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for my colleagues from New Hampshire and Connecticut and those who are very interested in this. They have the best of intentions. But with reluctance, I cannot support the amendment, and I encourage a "no" vote on it.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding because he mentioned our great colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY); and I know this is a matter of heartfelt importance to him and to his constituents, and to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) and to all the Members who have bases in their districts that have been targeted.

I have had bases removed from our defense complex in San Diego. I know what it means and how difficult it is, and I can just say that those constituents have had no finer representation than the people who are fighting for them right now. I understand this is a very difficult process. It is a tough one.

We do have another, through this summer, the opportunity for communities to make their case with their congressional leadership to the base closing commission, which reports on September 5; and that is the course that all Members will have to take.

It is a tough, tough call. I join with my friend from Colorado in his analysis of this particular situation. I think the horse is out of the stable at this point, and we need to move ahead with the process; but I want to thank everyone who is involved in this debate.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), for his leadership on this important undertaking.

In simplest terms, this amendment simply delays the process of realigning and closing bases across our country until certain events take place and certain reports are submitted to Congress by the Department of Defense. And there are several important reasons why this should take place.

First and foremost, Mr. Chairman, we are at war. We are at war. We have troops abroad fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. We should focus all of our energy on supporting these troops in the field. We should not be distracted with the complicated burden of realigning our whole military base structure here at home.

In October of 2003, I went to Iraq and learned that our troops were desperately in need of armor on their vehicles. One month later, the Secretary of the Army wrote to me and said getting armor into the field was a "top priority." A top priority, and yet today there are tens of thousands of vehicles in theater that are still not armored. We should be spending our time, Mr. Chairman, and our money on this life-threatening problem and not wasting time and energy and resources on realigning and closing bases.

Second, the strategic environment in which we are trying to operate is changing. The threats from North Korea, from China, from Iran are rising while we are still engaged in Iraq and Afghanistan. How do we know what the future basing requirements will be? We do not. We do not. The quadrennial defense review, the last one we did, is September 2001. The next one due is later this year. The quadrennial defense review will answer the questions that we need answered before we can decide what our basing needs are going to be.

Thirdly, closing bases costs billions of dollars. Not millions of dollars, billions of dollars. The Department of Defense cannot close or dispose of a property until it is properly cleaned up, but the investment of these cleanup dollars takes dollars away from our troops. That is wrong.

Fourth, I hope that our troops overseas will not be there forever. I look forward to when they come home. But when will they come home? Who knows? Where will they go when they come home? Who knows? As for the Guard and the Reserve, we do know that many of them will no longer have a Guard or a Reserve center when they get back.

For example, in my State of Connecticut, where I served for many years as a Reserve officer, they are recommending closing three Reserve centers and realigning the Air Guard's A-10s out of Bradley Field. Why is this good for morale of returning troops? It is not. Why does this help build the force and contribute to readiness of those Guard and Reserve forces still in this country? It does not.

I know from my own service as a member of the U.S. Army Reserve that the location of the drill center contributes to reenlistment and readiness. This is why we need to slow this process down and take a closer look.

Fifth, I represent the Naval Submarine Base New London located in Groton, Connecticut, the submarine capital of the world. Working with our friends around the country, we design, develop, build, maintain, base and deploy the best submarines in the world. The synergy between those who design and build submarines and those who drive them is critical to our national security.

One of the BRAC principles requires "access to logistical and industrial infrastructure capabilities optimally in-

tegrated into a skilled and cost-efficient industrial base." This synergy is just what we have between this submarine base and Electric Boat, which designs and builds these submarines. Yet the Department of Defense is violating its own principles for BRAC in making a recommendation to close the base.

Close the submarine base in Groton is kind of like taking cars out of Detroit. Decisions of this magnitude require time and study, and yet the Department of Defense has delayed release of vital data in support of their decision, making it impossible for us, the defense communities, to respond to these decisions in a timely manner. I still do not have the data that was used in their decisions, and yet the BRAC committee will be going up to Groton New London on the 31st of this month. We need additional time, Mr. Chairman, to make reasonable judgments.

We, as Members of Congress, have the responsibility under article 1, section 8 to provide for the common defense. Let us accept these responsibilities. Let us support the Bradley amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I too want to join in commending the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for his zealous advocacy on behalf of our men and women in uniform and on behalf of the national defense of this country. We have served together on the Committee on Armed Services, and he is a great, great member.

One of the problems that we have with base closure is we are not talking about bad bases. We are not talking about bases that are not achieving good things on behalf of America. We are not talking about bad workers that are somehow not cutting it. We are talking about wonderful people working at great and historic places that have been a vital part of the national security of our country. The problem is, the world has changed and our military must be leaner and smarter and save money to prepare for the future.

During the Committee on Armed Services markup, we had two different amendments on BRAC, one to eliminate it and one to delay it. The vote on the amendment to eliminate it was eight people for it and 50 against in the Committee on Armed Services. On the one to delay it, there were 10 votes in support of it and 47 against. Also, the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), are in opposition to this amendment, as they were during the committee markup.

Now, why is that? The issue that we have here is this is not a good process to go through, and the gentleman from Connecticut and New Hampshire make good points about wanting additional information and would like to have additional time. The problem is, we cannot take a time out. The United States cannot declare and say, Time out. We

need a couple, 3 or 4 years to go through finding the most efficient way of delivering our national security. The world does not work that way. There will never be a good time to do something like this.

As the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) pointed out, we have already had a considerable amount of effort put into coming up with the process thus far. That money will be wasted if we were to delay this further.

I think it also bears repeating, in reflection on the fact that the supporters of base closure have been bipartisan, both the Clinton administration and the second Bush administration have been in support of another round of base closures. When we look at the numbers of former Secretaries of Defense and former chairmen of the joint chiefs, they have been in support of another round of base closures.

And it is not just closure; it is realignment. It is shifting things around to modernize the military and to prepare for the efficiencies of the future. If we delay 1 year or 2 years or 3 years, it delays the savings that can come from a realignment and closure. Obviously, the American people expect us as lawmakers to administer government efficiently.

Probably the biggest concern I have, as someone who also has facilities in my district and in our State, we know the turmoil that communities go through. This will prolong that turmoil were we to adopt this amendment and delay it. So I strongly recommend a vote against this amendment. Let the process proceed in a very fair manner over the next 4 or 5 months.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for yielding me this time, and I appreciate his efforts on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Bradley amendment to delay the 2005 round of base closings and realignment because of questions involving these decisions, the timing, and also the way it is affecting my State.

The BRAC recommendations released by the Secretary of Defense include the removal of eight C-130 aircraft from the 130th Airlift Wing in Charleston, West Virginia. That means taking all the aircraft out. Do you have an air base without aircraft? I do not believe so. This removal will cost hundreds of jobs in the Kanawha Valley. The loss of the C-130s will strip the 130th of its primary mission, and it will hurt the West Virginia National Guard that responds to natural disasters in our State quite frequently and also inhibits their important mission in training and readiness.

The 130th Airlift Wing has a long reputation as one of the Nation's elite National Guard units. They have served in the first Gulf War, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and are currently in Iraq. They have demonstrated a commitment to service and sacrifice made by thousands of West Virginians and their families.

Despite adding four new units, the 130th is at 104 percent strength. The unit has a retention rate of nearly 97 percent, fifth best in the Nation. The National Guard Association has consistently ranked the 130th as one of the best units in the country. These are not the rankings of a unit that should be realigned.

The Bradley amendment to delay BRAC is the correct approach because the additional time will allow the Department of Defense and the BRAC Commission to gather accurate information about the bases they are closing and realigning.

□ 1745

In West Virginia's case, the Department of Defense makes the incorrect assertion that Yeager Airport is only large enough for eight C-130s, when it can already accommodate 14 C-130s, and they are making accommodations to accommodate up to 26 C-130s.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Bradley amendment to allow a comprehensive look at our defense needs prior to the closing of these important facilities.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bradley-Herseth-Simmons-Allen amendment to postpone the base closure process. Why are we closing military installations when we are at war? Why are we building new bases in Iraq while closing them in America? Will our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan have the right facilities to come home to?

These are the questions my constituents are asking. I do not have good answers, but neither does the Pentagon. This BRAC was formulated in 2001 before September 11 and before our occupation of two countries. The world has changed, but the process has not.

The Pentagon says it wants to bring home 70,000 troops, but the Overseas Basing Commission has found that the massive realignment of forces requires that the pace of events be slowed and reordered.

This validates our concern that this BRAC is the wrong process at the wrong time. If we do not do this right, our Nation risks losing key assets that can never be reconstituted, like the nuclear shipyard in Kittery, Maine. We jeopardize our security if we close infrastructure before we first come to

consensus on an overall defense and homeland security strategy.

Our amendment puts the horse where it belongs, before the cart. It requires implementation of the Overseas Basing Initiative, the Quadrennial Defense Review, the National Maritime Security Strategy and the Homeland Defense and Civil Support Strategy before BRAC takes effect.

It is the right process, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Bradley amendment.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Some Members wonder why I would support this amendment, considering the fact that I am the most fiscally conservative Member of Congress and vote for the least amount of spending. But I think this amendment is a good amendment, and I think the closing of these bases represents bad policy. I do not have a base in my district that is being threatened to be closed.

Let me tell Members why I think this is a mistake. First, I think the process is very poor. I think we are ducking our responsibility. To turn this responsibility over to a commission and duck the responsibility of facing up to making tough decisions, I think, is something we do too often. Too often in the Congress, we do things we should not be doing, and we forget to assume the responsibilities we have. In this case, I think we are not assuming the responsibility to face up to making this tough decision.

It is claimed we will save \$5 billion a year on base closings. We spend \$5 billion a month in Iraq. We are spending nearly a billion dollars in building an embassy in Iraq. We are going to build four bases in Iraq that are going to be permanent, costing tens of billions of dollars. I think we have our priorities all messed up.

I think that it makes a lot more sense to keep a submarine base in Connecticut and keep a deep seaport in Ingleside, Texas, than it does to be closing these down and at the same time building bases up around the world.

I think the savings issue is a red herring. Between 1995 and 2001, the last base closing, \$6.5 billion was spent, and \$6.1 billion was saved. So we are spending more money than we are saving in closing down these bases.

I have a quote here I want to read; it comes from a think tank, one of the defense policy think tanks. This to me is important. "The big story here is not going to be saving money; the big story is going to be preparing the force for future threats by moving it to more logical locations." In other words, defending our borders, protecting our

homeland, worry about defending this country is less important than spreading our troops and protecting the empire and expanding the empire and exposing us to greater danger.

This is an issue of policy. This is an issue of process, and this is a red herring when you think you are saving money. We are not going to be saving money in this process. We are just going to be giving an excuse to build bases around the world.

This is the time that we ought to reassess our policies and how we spend our money. This is why a 1-year delay is a perfect time to take time, stand back and figure out when we are going to get our troops home, when are we going to have a defense policy that defends this country and our borders rather than spreading ourselves so thinly around the world and building huge bases in foreign lands.

That, to me, is the real issue. I hope we take deep consideration and support this amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if you were to travel to North Carolina today, you would find the Navy out trying to buy 35,000 acres of land. Once they buy it, they have to get the environmental permits. Once they do that, they are going to bulldoze the woods and build a runway. After they build a runway, they build a firehouse. After they build a firehouse, they build the enlisted barracks. After that, they build the married housing. After that, they will have to have mess halls, a clinic, golf course, tennis courts, swimming pools, all of the things that people in uniform deserve.

They had all of those things. It is called Cecil Field. They had three 8,000-foot runways and a 10,000-foot runway. It had world-class dining facilities, world-class barracks and world-class family housing. It was already paid for by the American taxpayer, and they shut it down in a previous round of BRAC.

If Members need one word, or two words, to tell you why we do not need another round of BRAC, it is Cecil Field.

Right now, the Navy has to have a place to put their F-18E and Fs when they come off the carriers. Cecil Field would have been the perfect place, but no, because it was closed and the property was given away. And before we gave it away, we had to clean it up environmentally at no telling how many billions of dollars.

So before we closed it and gave it away, just to replace it by building it someplace else, maybe we should not make that mistake again. Maybe the people who are given the constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense, who every 2 years go out and beg for this job, which entails the constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense, maybe we

ought to make that call and maybe we should not rush into more bad judgments like Cecil Field.

Last year, this House by over a 100-vote margin passed the 2-year delay to BRAC. Now we have even more troops coming home from Korea and Iraq. We have agreed finally to grow the Army and the Marine Corps. Where are we going to put these folks if we are closing bases? And how many more mistakes like Cecil Field are we going to rush into just for the sake of doing something, even if it is wrong?

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I rise in support of it.

We could go through a list of all of the problems that will be created, but let me just paint a picture here. At Fort Monmouth in New Jersey, there are really the best people in the world, mostly civilians, engineers, scientists, procurement specialists, providing communications, surveillance, tracking friendly forces and unfriendly forces, providing equipment, services, software that men and women in the field in Iraq and Afghanistan need and use every day. Thousands of jobs will be sent elsewhere.

Now picture this: A commander in Iraq places an emergency call back to the U.S. The insurgents have changed the electronics in the roadside bombs, the IED devices, and they need new electronics to detect and disarm them. The reply, "I am sorry, that guy does not work here anymore. We are in the middle of realignment and we have not hired his replacement yet."

Repeated 5,000 times, "That guy does not work here anymore," that is what is at stake here. The gentleman from Arkansas says there is never a good time, there are no bad bases; this is a terrible time.

I can talk about the economic impact of moving jobs away from Fort Monmouth or to some other place. That is not the point. There are soldiers in the field. We are to look after their safety and effectiveness. The Secretary of the Army himself said before the BRAC Commission this past week that they have concerns whether those civilians, those experts with security clearance, with advanced degrees, with specialties, will make the move. How many years of reduced capability can we tolerate while we have men and women in the field?

This is a terrible time to proceed. Let us admit that we have gotten off on the wrong track, slow it down and look after the interests of the people in the field.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman

from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) 2 minutes.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for his hard work on this important issue and support the amendment today.

This amendment simply postpones the implementation of the Pentagon's BRAC recommendations until we have a more thorough inventory of our military assets and priorities. This is entirely appropriate and necessary, considering the number of operations our Armed Forces are currently engaged in around the world.

As we have heard, we are at war. I have great concern about the Pentagon's ability to adequately assess our needs and assets while there are so many soldiers abroad and while the Pentagon awaits recommendations and reviews pertaining to almost all of its branches of service.

My concern about the Pentagon's ability to adequately assess their needs is further heightened by their recommendation to close Cannon Air Force Base. This recommendation demonstrates to me that they have failed to adequately collect and interpret the facts. Cannon Air Force Base is the home of the 27th Fighter Wing and offers the Air Force and its pilots unrestricted air space and bombing ranges in which to train just off the runways. This is a rarity in today's Air Force as more and more bases experience increasing encroachment. Cannon has zero encroachment.

In addition, the Pentagon did not take into account the New Mexico Training Initiative, which is expected to be approved soon. This initiative would make Cannon's air space wider and taller and allow for training at supersonic speeds, another rarity today.

If we lose this air space, we lose it forever. I urge my colleagues to support the Bradley-Herseth amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bradley amendment. I do not believe that the Department of Defense's BRAC recommendations were based on facts and future threats, and I believe this amendment is critical to ensuring that we understand the security environment in which we are making BRAC decisions.

The Department of Defense's recommendations continue an irrational and dangerous assault on New England that would leave it as an undefended region of our Nation.

□ 1800

The proposals would close the best performing shipyard in the country, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, a facility that actually saves the Navy money by

completing its work ahead of schedule and under budget. They would realign Brunswick Naval Air Station, the last active military airfield in the Northeast, despite being described as critical to our national security by the Department of Defense. And they would close one of the most cost-efficient and innovative facilities in the Defense Finance and Accounting Service system located in Limestone, Maine.

Worst of all, the BRAC Commission and the affected communities do not even have the detailed information used by the Department of Defense to formulate their proposal. The delay by DOD in releasing the data to the BRAC Commission and local communities is an outrage. It calls into question the credibility of the process. And from reviewing the limited information that DOD has submitted, it turns out that some of the data used by DOD is actually inaccurate. BRAC is not an experiment for testing theories. Once we lose these assets, we cannot bring them back.

Mr. Chairman, our national security is at stake. We must move cautiously when we use these facts to justify our actions, and we must allow the critical actions outlined in this amendment to take place to make sure we understand our future threats before we close any of our key military assets.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I very much support the Bradley amendment. At a time when American troops are dying on a daily basis in Iraq, we simply cannot afford to disrupt the military framework that our soldiers rely on every day to help them in their mission and to keep them alive.

I want to say last week I listened to the BRAC hearings and I saw the commissioners ask many questions related to the fact that our military are now in combat. The Pentagon could not answer many of the more important questions that were asked by the BRAC commissioners. This was not the case in previous BRAC rounds. I have been here since 1988, and I have now been through three or four BRAC rounds. The fact of the matter is there were many unanswered questions regarding the future of our military, and it is simply not the right time to be shutting down military facilities here at home. If you listened to the BRAC last week and you listened to the questions, you could see why in fact the Bradley amendment makes sense.

I want to mention one thing about my base, Fort Monmouth, that was

mentioned already by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT). What many people do not realize, and I will use Fort Monmouth but it could be any base, in the case of Fort Monmouth, though, we have people on a daily basis, soldiers in the field and their commanders that will call back and ask for a particular type of communications or electronic equipment that may have to be altered in a matter of days or a number of weeks in order to be able to be prepared for combat, to defend the soldier in the field, to make sure that they are not wounded, to make sure that they are adequately prepared for combat.

Imagine a situation where in the course of the next 2 or 3 years, that research and development, that operation, that communication, electronics function, is transferred to another location and all that science and all that engineering background is lost. It would be very, very difficult to operate and make sure that that soldier in the field is properly equipped and is able to deal with that particular situation that he or she may face on a daily or weekly basis. That is why it does not make sense to do this in time of war.

Support the Bradley amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the many sage comments of supporters of this amendment. The gentleman from Colorado has opined that the BRAC Commission would reach the same conclusion if we were to grant this extension. I really question that. Since we are at war, we have engaged in two wars since the BRAC Commission was last considering these bases, we have had many humanitarian requests for assistance. Our men and women in uniform have been stretched thin all across this country and throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that we support the Bradley amendment because I believe that a comprehensive examination of our future defense needs, our potential threats, have not been adequately reviewed.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me this time. I thank the gentlemen from New Hampshire and Connecticut for their leadership on this issue.

The Base Realignment and Closure Commission is starting its visit to America's bases today and many of our communities do not have the data or the analysis to be able to explain where they are wrong. That is not fair. We are expanding the Army and the Marine Corps by 39,000 troops over the next 3 years and bringing back 70,000 troops and their families from overseas. We are fighting a war 6,000 miles

from home and about to go through a quadrennial defense review to restructure our forces and changing around the organization of the entire United States Army. BRAC was a bad idea when we started it, and it is an even worse idea today.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for yielding me the time and for his leadership here. I thank all of those who are participating in this evening's debate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in strong support of the Bradley/Simmons/Herseth/Allen amendment to postpone the base realignment and closure. This amendment will force the Department of Defense to postpone BRAC for 1 year until more information is out there. I believe it is imperative to have a real discussion of this issue before the closures begin.

The amendment would postpone the BRAC recommendations until 1 year after the last of the following actions occurs: the recommendations of the Commission to Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure are implemented by the Secretary of Defense; a substantial number of American troops return from Iraq as determined by the Secretary of Defense; the House and Senate Armed Services Committees receive the quadrennial defense review; the national maritime security strategy is implemented; and the homeland defense and civil support directive is implemented.

While I do not have any bases in my district, I recognize the devastation too many of my colleagues' districts who have bases will incur by the closure of those bases. In today's environment of job loss all around the country, many of these towns that depend on the military bases for their livelihoods will be simply devastated if these bases were to close. Before the Department of Defense closes bases, they need to keep in mind what the closure will do to the communities that have been supportive of our military for many, many years. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment to make sure we have all the facts before us before this process moves any further forward.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bradley amendment because my hometown, Cleveland, is losing 1,100 jobs. The Defense Finance and Accounting Service, DFAS, which is the fourth largest employer in Cleveland, is shifting these jobs to DFAS facilities in Columbus; Denver, Colorado;

and Indianapolis. The NASA Glenn Research Center will also lose 50 civilian military research jobs as a part of BRAC. The Army research laboratory at Glenn is losing the vehicle technology directorate. And, finally, the Navy Corps Reserve Center in Cleveland will close and lose 25 jobs.

The Secretary of Defense is required to consider the economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations. In this case, the Department of Defense erroneously states that a 0.1 percent job loss in the Cleveland metropolitan statistical area has minimal economic impact. However, the Department of Defense failed to take into account the current economic position of the Cleveland area.

Cleveland has been labeled as the poorest city in the country today. Its poverty rate of 31.3 percent is the highest in the Nation, according to the most recent Census Bureau data from 2003. Cleveland's number one ranking in poverty rate results from the significant job losses in the steel and manufacturing industries over the past several decades.

These job losses continue. For example, the current 2006 budget recently passed by Congress would slash up to 700 high-paying Federal jobs at the NASA Glenn Research Center. The economy around Cleveland is stagnating. It is inconceivable that the Department of Defense thinks that 1,100 more job losses will not have a major impact on the city of Cleveland.

If the process used to cut these jobs is flawed, I have no choice but to vote for a fix to disable the BRAC process.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Bradley amendment that would postpone the BRAC recommendations until 1 year after several important actions by the Department of Defense occur, including the recommendations of the Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure are implemented by the Secretary of Defense and the Armed Services Committees receive the quadrennial defense review. These are important and very telling studies that have not yet been completed that will give us in Congress a much clearer picture of our military's future landscape and needs.

For example, Mr. Chairman, I just returned a few moments ago from my district where I had the pleasure of meeting one of the nine BRAC commissioners as he toured Naval Air Station Atlanta in my district. While we were there, a comment was made that the commander of the facility would like to have rolled out the 40-plus planes, Humvees, and Cobra helicopters on the tarmac for review, but they are all deployed in the war on terror. Mr. Chairman, the DOD has recommended that these assets be realigned elsewhere. Yet I am concerned that proper due

diligence has not been paid to consider the overall force structure needs of the military, the very purpose of the QDR that will not be completed for months.

If BRAC is to occur, I believe that it can be carried out in a much more effective manner once we have a better idea about what the future holds.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) who is one of the cosponsors of the gentleman from New Hampshire's amendment.

Ms. HERSETH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to echo the comments made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) a little bit ago. It has been about a year since I came to Congress to represent South Dakota. This is one of those instances in which we do have time to do the right thing. We can take a step back and take a breath and realize that the train has not left the station and the growing frustration of Members of this body as you can see from the testimony offered today is about whether or not we have complete information for us to make wise and prudent decisions and for the commission to make wise and prudent decisions. And we can learn from the lessons of what is happening with our overseas Base Realignment and Closure Commission when they released major conclusions and recommendations on May 9, only 4 days before the BRAC list was released.

According to that report "the detailed synchronization required by so massive a realignment of forces requires that the pace of events be slowed and reordered. That is precisely what the Bradley amendment is requesting to do, an action this body has taken before.

Again, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Bradley amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me this time and appreciate this opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

I want to speak against the Bradley amendment. Many of my colleagues have stood at these microphones this afternoon and said it is our responsibility as Members of this House to perform this function. I would respectfully disagree with that. No one member of this committee could speak or vote to close a facility in their district.

□ 1815

I represent a community that has a base that was not on the list, and the euphoria of that day would be lost if we have to put that community back through this process over again.

All of the communities affected have an opportunity to present their best foot forward through the BRAC Commission's visits. The gentleman from Georgia has already said he met with one of the members of the BRAC Com-

mission on that base that was affected today. That process will go on. Those communities will be able to demonstrate to the Commission that the criteria were improperly applied to their bases and present their case for keeping those open.

So I respectfully disagree with the Members who have spoken in favor of the amendment and ask my colleagues to vote against the Bradley amendment.

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

It will not be much time because we are coming to the end of this. I just want to say this. I think we have heard some excellent debate here this afternoon, and the arguments have been very good, mostly in favor of the Bradley amendment and very positive. And if I thought it was possible for us to get from here to there in a reasonable manner, as those who serve on the Committee on Armed Services with me know, I would be very sympathetic with the Bradley amendment.

The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) particularly serve on the Committee on Armed Services. I serve with these gentlemen on the Committee on Armed Services. They are fine, decent, hard-working, thoughtful members of the committee that are valued by, I think, all of their colleagues on that committee.

And I got to thinking about this as we have approached this day, if anyone could have kept those bases of theirs off the list, they would have been able to do it because they have that kind of respect. But the gentleman from Texas made the point that the way the BRAC situation is set up is to take us out of that formula at this stage and to let the Department of Defense and then the Commission do their work. Once the Commission gets started, we can get back into it and do whatever we can do to do that, but it was designed to take politics out of it.

So the people who try to make a political issue out of someone's base closing, I think, are making a very bad mistake and are fooling the American public.

And we see this from both sides going on, rushing to say, oh, my gosh, if someone else had been there. No, that is not the case. This should not be a political issue; this should be a national defense issue. It should be evaluated based upon the need to defend this country. And we will have disagreements about what is needed and what is not needed, but that is what it should be based on. It should not be political.

I commend these gentlemen and all those who have spoken. They did an excellent job.

But I encourage people, reluctantly, not to support the Bradley amendment.

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

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

I will be brief here. I once again want to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for the work he does on behalf of our country and on national security. He is a great member of the committee.

I would like to restate two points. First of all, there is never a good time to do a round of base closure. The United States cannot say, let us take a break here for a few years, let us just stop having conflict, let us let the tension go away so we can all work this out on our time schedule.

It is not going to work that way. The world has never worked that way. There is never a good time. This is the time, and the process needs to move forward.

For those Members who are watching in their offices and who follow the committee process, the Committee on Armed Services dealt last week with two different amendments to either eliminate or delay the BRAC process, and the vote on one was 8 in support, 50 against. The other one was 10 in support and 47 against.

The committee now recognizes, as has been the gentleman from Colorado's (Mr. HEFLEY) metaphor, The horse is out of the barn, and the opposition to this amendment includes the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member.

With that, I recommend a "no" vote on the gentleman from New Hampshire's (Mr. BRADLEY) amendment.

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to commend my colleague from Arkansas and my colleague from Colorado for the very courteous way in which they have conducted this debate, allowing those of us who did not have adequate time to speak to be able to do so tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we must be very cautious before reducing our Nation's industrial base capability and base capacity. Many of the 33 bases are irreplaceable national security assets. For instance, the nuclear license facility in my area, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, it will never be recreated again if closed. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has served our Nation well for 200 years and saves taxpayers millions and millions of hard-earned dollars while returning our Nation's nuclear submarines to the water ahead of schedule.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that our Nation is fighting a war on terror. It began on a fateful morning in September 3½ years ago. Let us be careful before we close irreplaceable national security assets that we will not have the ability to recreate without either huge expense or local opposition.

This amendment appropriately delays that process, enables our Nation

to study that process so that we can best defend ourselves from the threats to our national security.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Bradley amendment.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Bradley amendment to H.R. 1815 to postpone the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) recommendations until Congress receives critical reports from the Overseas Basing Commission and the 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review.

Quite simply, this is the wrong process at the wrong time. Even as 100,000 of our men and women are in uniform are serving overseas in the Middle East and our armed services continue to miss their recruiting goals, this Administration has rushed forward with a plan that closes 33 major bases across the country. We should not be closing and consolidating bases and infrastructure here in the states now, when in another 2 years we may be bringing a significant amount of troops and equipment back from Europe and other forward deployed locations and we would have to spend more money again to reopen or recreate space for them.

Since the Pentagon released their recommendations on May 13, the BRAC commission has moved swiftly forward with its job. Yet even as BRAC begins to hold regional hearings and site visits as early as next week, the Pentagon has yet to release the detailed and facility specific information that was used to formulate their recommendations.

The BRAC process has the potential to drastically impact communities surrounding facilities slated for closure or realignment, and it is vital that this process be as open and opaque as possible. However, if the department continues to delay the release of this information, these same communities will be unable to assess or challenge the Pentagon's recommendations in the limited time they have remaining.

Anyone familiar with the 103rd Fighter Wing at Bradley, the Sub base in New London, and the assets both bring to our national defense are at a loss to explain these recommendations. The 103rd calls home an international airport with the capability and resources to host a range of aircraft, large and small—including Air Force One. Yet, the Pentagon apparently deemed Bradley unable to retain their current aircraft or take on more. In New London, one finds incredible and dynamic synergy between the base, the Sub School and an industrial base capable of manufacturing and repairing today's most advanced vessels. Yet, the birthplace of the modern submarine service was unable to garner enough military value points in the Pentagon's review to stay off the BRAC list.

Were other options explored? How did each score in critical evaluation areas? Did the Pentagon accurately assess both bases and their capabilities? Will leaving the state, like several others, without a flying unit affect recruiting and retention for the Air National Guard? These are all questions that hold the key to the future of the "Flying Yankees" and the Sub base—questions that cannot be answered until the Pentagon levels with us and countless other bases around the country facing the same delay.

I sincerely hope that there is no agenda behind this delay. But the clock is ticking and

deadlines are fast approaching. Next week, four commissioners will visit the New London Submarine base without ever seeing the facility specific data that led to its recommended closure. And, in little over a month, Connecticut will have the opportunity to present its rebuttal to the recommendations to the commission. The submariners, airmen and communities affected deserve the most thorough and extensive review possible because once these recommendations are implemented, they can never be undone.

There is no doubt that Connecticut was hit hard by BRAC, but this is not a political or parochial issue. This is an issue of ensuring the best possible defense of our Nation, and the best possible resources for our men and women in uniform. But neither this Congress, nor the BRAC Commissioners, can make a judicious and thoughtful review of these recommendations with the lack of data and shortened timeframe we now face.

In 2002 I voted in the Armed Services Committee to repeal the BRAC process outright, and again in 2003 to postpone it for 2 more years, because I have felt all along that the process had serious flaws. However, there is still time to put on the brakes before we reach the point of no return. That time is now. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their leadership on this issue and I rise in support of the Bradley/Simmons/Herseith/Allen amendment to the National Defense Authorization Bill.

Mr. Chairman, why are we proposing base closures during a time of war? This BRAC round should be delayed until the recommendations of the Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure are implemented by the Secretary of Defense, a substantial number of American troops return from Iraq, the House and Senate Armed Services Committees receive the quadrennial defense review, the National Maritime Security Strategy is implemented, and the Homeland Defense and Civil Support directive is implemented. It is important that these issues be addressed before implementing the BRAC process because once a base is closed, it can never be reopened.

In the 11th Congressional District and in Northeast Ohio, over 1100 jobs will be lost through the BRAC process. These job losses will have a tremendous economic impact on the City of Cleveland, which has been named "The Most Impoverished City" in the country. Now is simply not the time for BRAC; in Cleveland or around the country.

Communities affected by the BRAC process are going to be hit with a double whammy—once when the base closes and the military leaves town, then again when the Defense Department leaves an environmental mess behind: unexploded bombs, chemical contamination, and environmental toxins.

I believe we need to address the environmental and redevelopment issues pending from previous rounds before initiating another round of BRAC closings. According to the General Accountability Office, 28 percent of the bases closed in previous BRAC rounds have still not been transferred, which means about 219 square miles of property are sitting unused.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the importance of the BRAC process, however, now is simply not the time for it. I commend my Colleagues

STEPHANIE HERSETH and JOHN THUNE for introducing legislation to address this issue. I support this amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to the Fiscal Year 2006 Defense Authorization bill offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. BRADLEY. Like my friend from New Hampshire, I believe that the current BRAC round should be delayed and the process re-evaluated. Let me explain why.

At the BRAC hearing on May 4, BRAC Commission Chairman Anthony Principi and several other Commissioners asked Defense Department witnesses whether they had taken into account the need to house troops returning from Europe and other overseas locations as part of the BRAC evaluation. The Pentagon's witnesses assured the Commission that, yes, the department had indeed factored the returning troops into the equation, and that the proposed BRAC list would reflect those planning assumptions.

The next day—the very next day—Mr. Al Cornella, Chairman of the Overseas Basing Commission, issued a statement in which he said in part:

Our review leads us to conclude that the timing and synchronization of such a massive realignment of forces... requires that the proposed pace of events for our overseas basing posture be slowed and re-ordered. Such a step is of paramount importance in addressing quality of life issues for 70,000 returning American military personnel plus their families. Schools, health care and housing need to be in place at domestic receiving bases on the first day troops and their families arrive home.

Mr. Cornella went on to note that "The inter-agency process has not been fully used in the development of the Department's plan" and that "The Commission notes there has been almost no public discussion of this multi-billion dollar process that affects the security of every American."

In other words, DoD had failed to truly factor in the return of American forces from overseas into the BRAC equation . . . and the Overseas Basing Commission isn't the only independent body to question the Pentagon's BRAC criteria.

On May 3, the Government Accountability Office issued a report on the methodology used by the Pentagon in the BRAC process that states the Defense Department "did not fully consider the impact of force structure changes underway and the planned restationing of thousands of forces from overseas bases."

Mr. Chairman, we know the day is coming—and I pray that it's sooner rather than later—that those serving in Iraq and Afghanistan will be coming home. The Overseas Basing Commission and GAO are warning DoD and the Congress that we must ensure that any changes in our domestic basing structure do not leave these troops and their families with no place to call home. That's reason enough to delay the current BRAC round, but there are others.

The Defense Department will not submit its report on the Quadrennial Defense Review—the QDR, as it's known, is the Department's method of examining of America's defense needs from 1997 to 2015—until at least the first quarter of 2006, after the current BRAC round has run its course. Several BRAC Commissioners have questioned the wisdom of

proceeding with the current BRAC round before the QDR report has been delivered to Congress. I would argue, as others have, that this is another example of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. How can DoD restructure its forces for the future—including its domestic and overseas bases—when its primary blueprint for the future is still a work in progress?

For my part, I've also discovered a BRAC-related planning issue that the Pentagon does not appear to have addressed. Nowhere in the hundreds of pages of BRAC reports that DoD has thus far made public will you find a single reference to the difficulty in getting properly qualified scientists and engineers the security clearances they need in a timely fashion.

Why is this important? At the May 18 BRAC hearing on the Army's portion of the proposed BRAC list, Army Secretary Francis Harvey said, "I won't sit here and tell you that we expect all the people from Fort Monmouth to move to Aberdeen Proving Ground . . . I won't sit here and tell you that that's not a concern." Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the vast majority of the skilled scientists and engineers who have current security clearances won't move to Aberdeen Proving Ground or anywhere else. Their lives, their families, their research centers are all in New Jersey—and we can say the same thing about any other community with a military installation that employs a large number of skilled civilian specialists with security clearances anywhere in the country.

Every day at Ft. Monmouth, the talented engineers, scientists and technicians—working in secrecy—are providing the latest intelligence and communications technologies to our troops in the field, including the roadside bomb jammers that have become so very important in our struggle against the insurgents in Iraq. If we allow the Pentagon to play the BRAC equivalent of musical chairs with our critical research and development assets in wartime, we will lose thousands of skilled, trained, and cleared intelligence and communications specialists that we will not be able to replace for years. That's an unacceptable risk in wartime, Mr. Speaker, and for that reason and the other, strategic reasons cited by the Overseas Basing Commission and GAO, we need to terminate the current BRAC round. Let's restructure our military for the 21st century, but let's do it right, and minimize the risk to our warfighters in Iraq and Afghanistan. Again, I urge adoption of the Bradley amendment.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment.

Since the BRAC list was announced, many of my constituents have been asking the same question. Did the Pentagon, did the White House, take into account the homeland security implications of closing military bases?

The honest answer is that it doesn't appear so. In fact, it doesn't appear that anyone is obligated to consider the homeland security implications of these base closings.

On September 11, 2001, fighter jets from the 102nd Fighter Wing of the Otis Air Force Base on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, were the first military presence to arrive on the scene in New York City.

Just last week, the Air Wing escorted an Al Italia flight to Bangor, Maine, after it was discovered that a passenger on board was on the no-fly list.

Yet, Otis is slated for closure on the BRAC list.

It takes nine minutes for the fighters on Cape Cod to reach New York City. Nine minutes because they can take off and land in totally unrestricted air space. The same can't be said of Atlantic City—where some of the planes may be reassigned.

We shouldn't have to ask commercial air traffic to back off so we can scramble our own planes to defend us.

Contrary to the prevailing logic at the Pentagon, national defense and homeland security are not conflicting priorities—they go hand in hand. Many of these bases—like Otis—complement the defense of our homeland.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. BRADLEY and join him in his concerns about conducting a BRAC right now.

There are a number of concerns that I have about conducting base closures during a time of war, and without the benefit of global forethought.

I have spoken to the need for this Nation to be more focused and more careful about how we proceed.

We are conducting a global war.

We are closing bases overseas.

We are just one year out from our QDR to establish our global strategic footprint.

It is folly to proceed with domestic base closures while we are at war and unclear of our global military presence.

It is akin to replacing a hot engine in a flying plane—we ought not do it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bradley amendment. We are a nation at war and now is not the time to be closing American military bases.

In formulating the BRAC list, Secretary Rumsfeld ignored the base-closure criteria that Congress approved. Just yesterday, an Air Force BRAC spokesman admitted that the extensive criterion used to evaluate the strategic military value of each base was not adhered to by the Pentagon. Instead, the Base Closure Executive Group used their "collective judgment" to recommend closure for bases that had higher rankings—such as the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station—than many others which were kept off the list.

This amendment would let the DoD know that a group's "collective judgment" is not good enough. Secretary Rumsfeld better have some stronger arguments than "collective judgment," because his proposed BRAC list would cripple Guard and Reserve recruitment and weaken our homeland defense.

By passing this amendment, Congress would recognize that the DoD's base closure recommendations were budget-driven and did not take into account the military's long-term needs. I urge a "yes" vote on the Bradley amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

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

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 109-96.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 26 Offered by Ms. WOOLSEY:

At the end of title XII (page 427, after line 11), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1223. WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should—

(1) develop a plan as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act to provide for the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq; and

(2) transmit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains the plan described in paragraph (1).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 293, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the members of the Committee on Rules for making this important amendment in order. It has been a long time coming for Congress to discuss this war in Iraq and how we will plan to end the terrible suffering it is causing our troops, their families, and the Iraqi people.

First and foremost, I honor and I support the brave men and women who are serving our country in Iraq, and I believe that the best way to support them is to establish a plan to bring them home.

In just over 2 years of war, more than 1,600 American soldiers and an estimated 25,000 Iraqi civilians have been killed. The number of American wounded, according to the Pentagon, is greater than 12,000, and that does not even count the invisible mental wounds they are bringing home, afflicting tens of thousands of our soldiers.

And, of course, with more than \$200 billion on the line, do the Members not think that the American people deserve to know what the President plans to do in Iraq?

I also honor the many voters who risked their lives to "give Iraq back to the Iraqi people." But our continued presence in Iraq after the election has caused America to be seen by the Iraqi people as an occupying power, not as a liberating force. Our continued presence in Iraq works against efforts for democracy, provides a rallying point for angry insurgents, and ultimately makes the United States less safe.

My amendment expresses the Sense of the Congress that the President

must develop a plan to bring our troops home and that he must submit this plan to the appropriate committees in Congress. We can truly support our troops by bringing them home.

At the same time, withdrawing U.S. troops must not result in abandoning a country that has been devastated. We must assist Iraq, not through our military but through international humanitarian efforts to rebuild their war-torn economic and physical infrastructure. We need to defend America by relying on the very best of American values, our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership.

Mr. Chairman, Congress must support our troops, and we must begin the difficult recovery process from a long and destructive war. But first, the President must create a plan to bring our troops home. Our troops deserve nothing less.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

Make no mistake about it. This amendment is a message-sender. It is a message-sender to people like Al Sadr who are considering even now continuing to foment rebellion against the elected government in Iraq. It is a message-sender to Zarqawi and his followers, who think that perhaps the United States does not have the stomach to continue to oppose them. It is a message-sender to our troops, who might, in seeing if this amendment should pass, feel that the resolve of the American people is fading away.

This is precisely the kind of a message we do not want to send to friend and foe alike, and certainly not to the 140,000 Americans serving presently in Iraq, who feel that the country is strongly behind them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I speak not simply as a Member of Congress, but as a former enlisted soldier and military officer.

I find myself somewhat dismayed that we have to spend time here today debating an amendment that would tell our enemies when our forces are going to withdraw from Iraq. This amendment is tantamount to posting a billboard saying, "We will be gone by 5 o'clock Friday. If you wait until 6 o'clock, you can perform a murderous rampage through this growing democracy and terrify and intimidate the people back into living under a despotic regime."

I respect the gentlewoman's passionate declarations regarding tolerance, diversity, and the rights of women, all of which would be ruthlessly, violently, and murderously suppressed if we were to leave at this time, something I am sure she would not want to see happen.

Some might argue that this amendment does not set a timetable, but rather states that Congress just wants to see a plan. The amendment, some would argue, is innocuous. I cannot stress enough how damaging this amendment would be, if it passes, to our troops, to our national security, and also to the Iraqi democracy.

Our troops in the field look to us for strength and solid, confident, unwavering leadership. If this passes, they would instead see a government that does not possess the fortitude to hold the course and finish the job. If this passes, their families would see a Congress that cares more for timelines and wordy resolutions than it does for the safety of their loved ones.

We also need to understand how others will see this around the world. If this passes, the Iraqis, who every day put their lives on the line to form security forces and battle terrorists in their streets and in their neighborhoods, would see a military that is not committed to training them to defend themselves. They would see an America that broke its promise to walk with them to democracy and independence.

If this passes, the world would see a country that takes no pride in its role in establishing a free Iraq, one that confirms the lies of the terrorists that we are weak and lack the fortitude and resolve to finish this mission.

Are we going to let less than 1 percent of the Iraqi population dictate our course and the course of the Iraqi people? I say no. Our enemies would stand up if this passes and cheer the moment it is passed because they would know that we will desert the Iraqi people who have invested their blood to defeat.

Mr. Chairman, we will not abandon a people who have so willingly given of themselves for the dream that we can help them achieve. Mohandas Gandhi said, "The spirit of democracy cannot be imposed from without. It has to come from within." The people have democracy in their hearts. They can feel it within their grasp. They can look up and see it shining near them. We just have to stand and give them a hand to reach for it.

It is all the more distressing to me that we would consider this amendment so close to Memorial Day, a day when we honor the courage and the valor of our veterans, especially those who gave the ultimate sacrifice. We can all sleep better at night because of the blood shed by ordinary heroes who believe their government supported them and believe they were doing the right thing.

□ 1830

I recently spent 3 days visiting with numerous units of the United States Special Operations Command. Their valor, their commitment to protecting our freedom is insulted by bringing forth this amendment so close to Memorial Day.

I ask my colleague to join me in opposing this amendment in honor of

those who have gone before us and in honor of those whose names we do not yet know, but will learn as we read of their sacrifice.

Let our foes understand one thing. Our exit strategy from Iraq is simply this: winning the war on terror. We must hold firm to the course and be resolved in our determination to win this fight.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stand with us today and reaffirm our commitment to our troops, to their families, to our country, to the Iraqis and to our enemies that we will not retreat in the face of this evil.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my side, my leader on the Committee on Armed Services who I have great respect for, this is not about our troops. This is about a policy, that I believed when I voted 2 years ago to commit the troops that I was making my decision on facts. Since that time, I have been very disappointed in what I have learned about the justification for going into Iraq. Afghanistan, absolutely. We should be there. We should probably have more troops. But we cannot have more troops when they are in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to this effort by the gentlewoman from California, we have never voted one time together, not one time in the 11 years I have been here. But, Mr. Chairman, I have beside me a picture of a young man whose name is Tyler Jordan. His daddy was a gunny sergeant killed two years ago, Phillip Jordan. He has under his arm the flag that was over the coffin.

To my left are just a few faces of those who have died for this country. They died doing what they thought was right for America, and God bless them.

But all this amendment does is just say that it is time for the Congress to meet its responsibility. The responsibility of Congress is to make decisions whether we should send our men and women to war or not send them to war. What we are saying here tonight is we think it is time for the Congress to begin, to start the debate and discussion of what the exit strategy is of this government, whether it be 2 years down the road, 3 years down the road, or 1 year.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying tonight is we have a responsibility. We should not be into some endless, endless war in Iraq, when we have so many other countries that we need to be watching much more carefully than Iraq. So I hope that this resolution passes and we can start meeting our responsibilities of discussing the policy for America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank our great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment because it is totally unnecessary. In fact, no one who has ever studied at a war college, no one who is a combat commander, no military strategist, no one who really wants to achieve victory, would ever support what this amendment is asking those of us in the House to support here today. Besides, we already have a timetable for withdrawal from Iraq, and that is when we have achieved victory, that is when we have helped to deliver freedom to the Iraqi people, and that is when we have secured a foothold for liberty in the Middle East.

My question is this: Did we ask General Eisenhower for a plan for the withdrawal of the forces from Europe before the war was won? Of course not. And I would ask this: Did we ask General McArthur for a plan for withdrawal in the Pacific before the war was won? Of course not.

Mr. Chairman, it makes no sense to telegraph our plans to the enemy. In fact, that would be an incredibly dangerous thing for us to do. But our enemies should know this: America will not cut and run. And to the Iraqi people, I would say this: liberty, democracy and freedom are coming, and the men and women of the American Armed Forces, God bless them, will help you achieve all of them.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This is a very modest amendment. As a sense of Congress provision, it is a recommendation from Congress, not a requirement. It sets no date by when the President must present a plan to Congress, just as soon as it is practicable. I cannot imagine why anyone would oppose this language.

Currently, we have close to 140,000 uniformed men and women in Iraq. No matter where you stand on the question of Iraq, we owe it to these courageous men and women, and to their families, to let them know when and how we will bring them home to stay.

Mr. Chairman, it is easy to start a war; but it is hard to get out of one. It is easy to go along and accept the military occupation. It is a lot harder to take an honest look at where we are now and determine when and how we are going to get out. But that is what we need to do, and we need to do it now.

As a Congress, we should be ashamed that we have not demanded such a report from the President. This is the least we can do, to suggest that he send one.

There has been no accountability with regard to this war, and this Con-

gress has been all too content to just go along with an open-ended occupation. It is time we change that complacency. It is time we do our job. Support the Woolsey amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¾ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I would speak today in strong opposition to this amendment of my colleague from California. First, let me say that I certainly understand their concern about the safety and well-being of our dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces who are currently deployed in Iraq. I, too, look forward to their safe and expeditious return home to the United States and to their loved ones.

However, I cannot support this amendment, as I believe it sends exactly the wrong message concerning our current commitment in Iraq and gives aid and comfort to those who oppose us.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that passing this amendment will send a clear signal to the insurgents in Iraq that Congress, and by extension the United States, is wavering in our commitment to their defeat. Doing so would create the impression that their terrorist tactics are working and that a U.S. withdrawal from the region is imminent.

The last thing we want to do is create a new burst of enthusiasm for the misguided causes championed by the insurgents and al Qaeda. Establishing a plan for withdrawal would give those groups the hope that they are wearing down our resolve when, instead, we need to be clear in our commitment to defeating the insurgents in Iraq.

Further, I believe that this amendment would serve only to discourage those Iraqi citizens who are dedicated to building a stable and secure democracy and defending it against terrorist factions. The coalition forces involved in the Multinational Security Transition Command in Iraq are working hard to build and train a competent Iraqi security force capable of defending their government and aiding the transition to democracy. Thus far, they have demonstrated initial success, as evidenced by the ISF's role in securing polling locations during the January elections.

It is imperative that we continue to mirror their commitment and remain dedicated to the stabilization efforts as they work toward the ultimate goal of a free and democratic Iraq. This amendment would, in my opinion, undermine the Iraqis' confidence in our continuing support.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to stress that we in Congress, in addition to the President and the Department of Defense leadership, do not want to maintain a U.S. military presence in Iraq one day longer than is nec-

essary. Clearly, the goal is to bring our troops home as quickly and as efficiently as possible. However, we cannot do so until we succeed in enabling the Iraqis to defend themselves, secure their borders, and ensure the success of this new democracy.

We agree there are certain milestones that must be met before we can in good conscience withdraw our forces from Iraq. It is not prudent to set an arbitrary date or timeline about which we can only speculate. While my colleague's amendment does not specify specifically a required date or timeline, I believe any formal plan would be misinterpreted and would send the wrong message.

As the President has stated, "It is inappropriate to put a specific timeline on the ultimate goal of ensuring that the Iraqi people can take care of themselves, protect themselves and provide for their fellow citizens."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and send a message to the Iraqi forces and the Iraqi people, as well as to the insurgent groups, that the U.S. Congress and, by extension, the United States of America, is fully committed to the establishment of a stable and secure democracy in Iraq.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me time.

The reason I am rising to support her amendment is because I think that we have come to a time in the war in Iraq where Democrats and Republicans alike need to consider all the events that have transpired, to do it in a way that is compassionate for the decisions that were made to send us into war, and to do it without recriminations, without challenging each other's integrity, without challenging each other's love for our country or support for the troops.

Democrats and Republicans came together to send this country to war. We can only come together to take this country out of Iraq. You start to see the signs that make it so apparent that the time is near. The time is near when this Congress must consider the reality facing our troops, the reality of the circumstances which sent our troops into battle. And we need to do this as colleagues who may have started from different points of view on Iraq. I certainly have a different point of view. I voted against the war. But now we are starting to see people who voted for the war coming forward and expressing their concerns.

We have to have that capacity for rational reflection and an ability, not to say so much that we were wrong, but to say we have new information and we therefore have a right to reappraise the situation and take a new direction. The Woolsey amendment gives us a chance to do that, and it sets us on a path.

So whether it is the Woolsey amendment or something that happens in the

next few weeks and months, Democrats and Republicans are going to have to come together to help the President get out of the mess that this country is in.

So I think we can proceed in a spirit that is amicable. We do not have to be beating each other up on this. We do not have to have a war about war, or certainly a war about a peaceful withdrawal.

So the Woolsey amendment is an important step in the direction of setting this country on a path towards extricating ourself from Iraq. For that reason, I support it, and I want to commend her for her activity on behalf of it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a veteran of Desert Storm and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because of its timing. It is wonderful to talk about an exit strategy, if in fact it was timely to do so. But I oppose the timing of this conversation and debate.

As a Nation and society committed to freedom and democratic principles and peace, I believe this amendment at this time would undermine our core values and the mentorship that we are having with a new, free country.

When the President declared the global war on terrorism and Congress authorized the use of force in Iraq, the United States made a significant investment in world peace. Like any sound investment, our investment in peace is subject to volatility and outside influences. The forces of evil that oppose the U.S. liberation of Iraq are the same forces in Iraq that want to suppress women and children, kill innocent people, attack schools, hospitals and religious institutions.

Asking for an exit strategy for U.S. forces at this time is essentially calling it quits, and that is not the America I know. I believe that peace and freedom are inextricable and inseparable. Forsaking the Iraqi people in their hour of need is counter to the fabric of this great Nation.

As a newly established free society, the Iraqi people are in their infancy of establishing the rule of law. Like the birth of any nation, there will be growing pains and unpleasant and tragic events. But let us be very clear: it has been the United States and our coalition partners that have given the Iraqi people hope.

So this debate with regard to setting an exit strategy or a timetable for withdrawal, again, is not timely. It would be arbitrary. It is the mission that determines the exit strategy.

Mr. Chairman, the debate we are having here really is not too much different from the debate we had during the Balkans, at the time when President Clinton, to his credit, brought the guns to silence. But what he said was,

"I want to commit U.S. ground troops for only 1 year."

□ 1845

The Republicans immediately said, But, Mr. President, that is not an exit strategy. You cannot say we will only send the troops for 1 year, because it is the mission that will determine the exit. The exit then was determined in the civil implementation of the Dayton Accords by creating benchmarks for the success of the implementation of Dayton.

So it is the mission with regard to stable civil institutions in achieving benchmarks of that free society in Iraq that will determine the exit strategy. The stabilizing of Iraq is extremely important. The training of their security forces is extremely important. And I assure my friends that the more that the insurgents attack security forces and police forces in Iraq, mosques, schools, innocent people within Iraq, it builds the esprit of the Iraqi people themselves, who are a very proud people, that they want to take these insurgents who are not of their land, not of their people and expel them from their land. I assure my colleagues that they equally, at that moment in time, will be just as eager for us to come home.

So it is the mission that will determine the exit strategy. This amendment, while worthy and noble in its cause, is just not timely and, therefore, I will oppose the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, what a great day this is. After 73 times on the floor, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) now has an amendment to discuss a plan to develop a plan as soon as practicable to provide for the withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces from Iraq. Here are Members of the House of Representatives who are, if we look at Article I, Section 8, the only ones that can declare war under this great Constitution, saying, We do not even want to talk about a plan.

Well, I say to my colleagues, the President of the United States has already said that America does not plan an indefinite occupation of Iraq, and neither do the independent Iraqi people. So what we want our colleagues to understand is that Congress can talk about this. Please, summon up your courage. That is your job. That is why we are here.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, summon up my courage? I do not think I have to question anybody to summon up my courage. I am a combat veteran, I was shot down in Vietnam, I was shot, and you do not tell the enemy what you are going to do, because you put those people at risk.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that as a combat veteran, I spoke to literally thousands of other combat vet-

erans, and it is amazing the differences of their opinions versus liberal politicians.

Our kids over there are proud of what they do. Yes, I want them back. I wanted to get out of Vietnam just like anybody else, but I did not want to leave before the job was done. I do not want the over 1,700 men and women that have died in Iraq to die for nothing. And if we go ahead and tell the enemy what we are going to do, we put those kids at risk.

I just think it is wrong. From my experience in the military of 20 years, it is wrong, what the gentlewoman is trying to do. She has good intentions. But I will tell my colleagues that if we let folks know what we are going to do, I say to the gentlewoman, it is going to put those men and women at risk, and I think it is wrong.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, as a co-sponsor of the Woolsey amendment calling on the President to develop and implement a plan to begin the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq and to take other steps to provide the Iraqi people with the opportunity to control their internal affairs, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, although I strongly opposed the preemptive war in Iraq, which the administration promoted based on false information and which has resulted in tragic loss of American and Iraqi lives, I would have supported as many troops as necessary in Afghanistan where our enemy, Osama bin Laden, was.

I do not believe that it would be fair to abandon the Iraqi people at this juncture. So, therefore, we should look towards having the United Nations create an international peacekeeping force to keep Iraq secure.

I would also like to take this opportunity, though, to commend a group of activists in my congressional district who are lending their voices to the important debate about our future in Iraq. South Mountain Peace Action, representing residents of Maplewood and South Orange, New Jersey, are strongly committed to seeking an international solution, led by the United Nations, and a rapid return of U.S. soldiers. Nearly 80 percent of Maplewood and South Orange voters and 52 percent of New Jersey voters voiced their agreement that President Bush's war in Iraq is the wrong war at the wrong time in the wrong place.

The war has already exacted a heavy price. More than 1,600 American lives have been lost and over 10,000 servicemen and women have been wounded. More than 100,000 Iraqi civilians have lost their lives, and \$210 billion have been spent.

I urge support of the Woolsey amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHWARZ).

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Woolsey amendment.

As a veteran of two tours of duty in Vietnam, I do not think it is appropriate to pull the forces out. The Iraqis want us to stay until the government takes on its full mission. Creating a timetable for withdrawal would hand the military initiative over to the insurgents and undermine the Iraqi Government to draft a constitution and prepare for a constitutional government.

As Generals Myers, Pace, and Abizaid have reminded us, the enemy gets a vote on how the war is fought. Iraqi-U.S. coalition forces need flexibility to respond to any enemy offensive which a benchmark-based plan for withdrawal would absolutely preclude.

I believe the amendment is well-intentioned, but the President, the Secretary of Defense, General Abizaid and the democratically elected Government of Iraq agree that it would not be in U.S. or Iraqi interests for the U.S. to remain in Iraq any longer than the government wants us there, but they are committed to reducing the U.S. presence only when that U.S. presence can safely be reduced and no sooner.

Vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, Monday's Guardian's editorial line was, "U.S. Military to Build Four Giant New Bases in Iraq."

The violence in Iraq has never been greater. That is not what winning looks like to me.

The President's strategy is to re-create the Old West: Build four forts capable of withstanding mortar rounds. With the death toll and casualties mounting, the President's best idea is to keep U.S. soldiers in the midst of uncontrollable, horrific violence.

This administration has put this Nation and our generals in a no-win situation. We have been there before in Vietnam, and we vowed never to let it happen again. But this administration has frayed the military, keeping soldiers in the target zone without enough armor to protect them and without a plan to bring them home.

Colonel David Hackworth died about 2 weeks ago, a highly decorated combat veteran of the Vietnam War, eight Purple Hearts, a soldier's soldier who recently died, said we will be in Iraq for 30 years, 30 years. Colonel Hackworth was a man who saw the battlefield and could see the folly of the Iraq war.

The American people know the truth. The President misled this country into war, and it is time to get out.

[From the Guardian, Monday, May 23, 2005]
U.S. MILITARY TO BUILD FOUR GIANT NEW BASES IN IRAQ

(By Michael Howard in Baghdad)

U.S. military commanders are planning to pull back their troops from Iraq's towns and cities and redeploy them in four giant bases in a strategy they say is a prelude to eventual withdrawal.

The plan, details of which emerged at the weekend, also foresees a transfer to Iraqi command of more than 100 bases that have been occupied by U.S.-led multinational forces since the invasion of Iraq in March 2003.

However, the decision to invest in the bases, which will require the construction of more permanent structures such as blast-proof barracks and offices, is seen by some as a sign that the U.S. expects to keep a permanent presence in Iraq.

Politicians opposed to a long-term U.S. presence on Iraqi soil questioned the plan.

"They appear to settling in a for the long run, and that will only give fuel for the terrorists," said a spokesman for the mainstream Sunni Iraqi Islamic party.

A senior U.S. official in Baghdad said yesterday: "It has always been a main plank of our exit strategy to withdraw from the urban areas as and when Iraqi forces are trained up and able to take the strain. It is much better for all concerned that Iraqis police themselves."

Under the plan, for which the official said there was no "hard-and-fast" deadline, U.S. troops would gradually concentrate inside four heavily fortified air bases, from where they would provide "logistical support and quick reaction capability where necessary to Iraqis". The bases would be situated in the north, south, west and centre of the country.

He said the place of the "troop consolidation" would be dictated by the level of the insurgency and the progress of Iraq's fledgling security structures.

A report in yesterday's Washington Post said the new bases would be constructed around existing airfields to ensure supply lines and troop mobility. It named the four probable locations as: Tallil in the south; Al Asad in the west; Balad in the centre and either Irbil or Qayyarah in the north.

U.S. officers told the paper that the bases would have a more permanent character to them, with more robust buildings and structures than can be seen at most existing bases in Iraq. The new buildings would be constructed to withstand direct mortar fire.

A source at the Iraqi defence ministry said: "We expect these facilities will ultimately be to the benefit of the domestic forces, to be handed over when the U.S. leaves."

Three Romanian journalists kidnapped in Iraq were freed yesterday after two months in captivity.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Woolsey amendment.

This amendment does not say, Cut and run. This amendment does not call it quits. It asks the President for an exit strategy. And since the President declared victory in Iraq, more than 1,500 Americans have been killed. The Bush administration still has not laid out a strategy to win the peace in Iraq and bring our American forces home.

Now, when he was Governor of Texas, this is the advice that George W. Bush gave President Clinton about the war

in Kosovo. Victory, he said, means exit strategy, and it is important for the President of the United States to explain to us what the exit strategy is.

Now, that is what Governor Bush said about President Clinton and the war in Kosovo, and the need for an exit strategy is even more apparent in Iraq. In the absence of an exit strategy, the administration continues to pursue the same strategy that has only led to more casualties and less stability. We have killed or captured 1,000 to 3,000 insurgents every month for more than a year. But with thousands of new recruits, the insurgency strengths have quadrupled.

Without an exit strategy to win the peace and bring our troops home, our policy is going in circles.

Our troops have won tactical victories, but they have not translated into strategic advances. Any successful strategy in Iraq has to address the fundamental factors that are continuing to fuel the insurgency.

One of those factors is the suspicion that U.S. troops are going to occupy Iraq indefinitely. Those suspicions are being reinforced by the fact that we have three or four times as many troops in Iraq today as the administration predicted we would. Until we lay out a framework for bringing our troops home and replacing them with Iraqis, the Iraqi people will never feel that they are in control of their own destiny.

A clear exit strategy would help splinter insurgent groups who have set aside their own differences in order to unite against the United States. It would send a message to the Iraqi Government that it needs to take responsibility for its own security. And, finally, an exit strategy is that light at the end of the tunnel that our troops need and the taxpayers need.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and cochair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), for her leadership in offering this amendment.

I stand here today as the proud daughter of a veteran of two wars. Let me just say, this amendment says what we have been saying all along, and it is time to make it real in terms of supporting our troops. The way we support our troops is by developing a plan to get them out of harm's way and to bring them home.

To date, more than 1,600 American troops have given their lives, over 11,000 American troops have been injured, and over 17,000 innocent Iraqi civilians, including women and children, have died in a war that should never have started in the first place.

I distinctly remember the day in May 2003 when the President stood on the deck of the USS *Abraham Lincoln* and proclaimed, "Mission Accomplished." Of course, the administration has

called off the search for weapons of mass destruction because there simply were not any. But the occupation still continues.

We have seen a war that has created a haven for terrorists in Iraq. We have seen troops become targets of the insurgency when they were supposed to be liberators.

Mr. Chairman, the President needs to be honest with the American people and tell us what his plan is, and that is what this amendment says. Give us a plan to bring our troops home. It is very important. We need an exit strategy.

The taxpayers have spent over \$200 billion, soon to be \$300 billion, and we have little or no accountability for where this money has gone.

I congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for this amendment. We should send the signal that we support our troops, we love our troops, we value our troops, and we want them home.

□ 1900

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and I thank him again for his leadership. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for allowing us to have the opportunity to stand on the floor of the House just a few days away from honoring America's war dead, and I hope that this debate is not in any way suggesting our lack of respect and admiration for those fallen as well as their families. I do not believe the distinguished gentlewoman from California has any idea or any sense of disrespecting the Nation's fallen dead. In fact, so many of us, no matter where we have come from, have soldiers and families living among us, families that mourned and families that are willing and wanting for their loved ones to come home.

This is not Vietnam in terms of the approach that those of us who are against the war would put it in that context. We understand that the troops are following the orders of their leaders, the Commander in Chief, the United States Congress. That is why this amendment puts the burden on the United States Congress and asks for the President to create a success strategy, an exit strategy that will allow these troops to come home.

This is about conserving resources. We have 140,000 troops in Iraq. We have equipment that is stretched. We have questions about the armor that is being utilized by our troops, the body armor. We have 60 people dead in the last 24 hours and eight of our troops dying in the last 24 hours and troops dying every single day. And you know what the tragedy of it is? That when

our fallen heroes come to the soil of the United States we cannot even view their bodies with the flag draped over their coffin. We are denied that opportunity to mourn them.

So this amendment is really to respond to the need that the Congress have the opportunity to address the question in hearing and to review the President's offering of a withdrawal or a success strategy, in great respect to the men and women in the United States military, in great respect to the families, in great respect to those who have lost their lives.

I ask my colleagues to consider this amendment primarily to give us an opportunity to do our constitutional duty, and that is a declaration of war is a constitutional duty by this Congress to declare war. We failed in that duty a couple of years ago, in 2002 September. But let us accept the challenge to review the process and the strategy of this administration.

I close by simply saying to the executive, I ask you to join us in a collaborative effort to have a vote for peace and to be able to conserve the resources and to honor our fallen dead and those who now serve, that we respect their families, respect, in fact, their lives and we will craft a strategy to return our heroes home. That is not in any way giving up on them. That is saving them.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I would like to thank the members of the Rules Committee that made this important amendment in order. It is about time that in the Congress we discuss what is going on in the war in Iraq. And it is only too bad that we had only 15 minutes for this, well, a half an hour, 15 minutes on both sides, for this very, very important issue that is facing everybody in the United States of America, our troops and their families and the Iraqi people.

My amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that the President must develop a plan to bring our troops home, that he must submit this plan to the appropriate committees in Congress so that we can truly support our troops and bring them home where they are safe.

So in closing, Mr. Chairman, Congress must support our troops. We must begin the difficult recovery process from a long and destructive war. The President has to create a plan and tell us what he is going to do, and he must get these troops home before we lose any more lives. This is the best way to support our troops, and they deserve nothing less.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 30 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, we have an exit strategy, and that exit

strategy is a free Iraq and a free government in Iraq and a military which is strong enough to protect that government. And that is the military that we are standing up right now, and that is the mission, and that is the timetable. And I would hope that the gentlewoman's amendment would be defeated.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, a safe and democratic Iraq is a goal I share with every American. Congresswoman WOOLSEY's amendment is critically important for reaching this goal. The amendment urges the administration to lay out a plan for withdrawing U.S. troops from Iraq. This amendment does not demand the U.S. troops be withdrawn from Iraq immediately or prematurely. It simply requests that the President establish a plan for when he will begin to bring our soldiers back home.

The best way to make Iraq a strong and democratic country is to give Iraqis the training and education necessary for them to assume responsibility for their own security needs and to develop their civil society infrastructure. Iraqis yearn for freedom and democracy, and ownership of their own country. American soldiers, sailors and marines want to return home to be reunited with their families. A withdrawal plan is in the best national security interests of the United States and in the best interests of a democratic Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to support the Woolsey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 19 was disposed of by the adoption of amendment No. 1.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 109-96.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 27 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

At the end of title XII (page 427, after line 11), insert the following new section:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA ON ISSUES PERTAINING TO MISSILE DEFENSE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) cooperation between the United States and Russia with regard to missile defense is in the interest of the United States;

(2) there does not exist strong enough engagement between the United States and Russia with respect to missile defense cooperation;

(3) the United States should explore innovative and nontraditional means of cooperation with Russia on issues pertaining to missile defense; and

(4) as part of such an effort, the Secretary of Defense should consider the possibilities for United States-Russian cooperation with respect to missile defense through—

(A) the testing of specific elements of the detection and tracking equipment of the Missile Defense Agency of the United States Department of Defense through the use of Russian target missiles; and

(B) the provision of early warning radar to the Missile Defense Agency by the use of Russian radar data.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 293, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I wish I did not have to offer because the amendment follows the language of the President of the United States, our leader, who has called for joint cooperation with Russia on missile defense.

The amendment calls for the language of our Secretary of Defense, who has called for joint cooperation on missile defense. The language calls for an amendment that my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I offered in 1998 in H.R. 4 that actually calls for a national missile defense, and as a part of that called for joint cooperation on missile defense.

In fact, the weekend before the vote on H.R. 4, I took Don Rumsfeld, private citizen; Jim Woolsey, private citizen; Bill Snyder, private citizen; and Democrat Jim Turner and other Republicans to Moscow, and we told the Russians that our move in moving forward on missile defense and not only abrogating the ABN treaty was not about us scoring a strategic advantage over them, but was about an effort to protect ourselves, as they had been doing with their system around Moscow. And we told them that we saw threats coming from North Korea, China and Iran and, therefore, we had to take the action.

Mr. Chairman, for the past several years we have had a joint program with the Russians called RAMOS. A year ago, our four star general, General Kadisch, came in and said to me, Congressman, I have got to cancel the program, but I want to do a follow-on with the Russians. And I said, that is great because that is the intent of the President and that is the intent of the Congress. He said, But Congressman, I cannot get a meeting with my Russian counterparts.

So in April of last year, we took, at the request of General Kadisch and General Obering, General Shackleford to Moscow with us. And General Shackleford sat across the table in Straya Polochad, the equivalent of the West Wing in Moscow with General Balyevsky who would become the chief of the general staff. During the summer of last year, they negotiated a

multi-phase agreement to work with the Russians on joint use of their large phased array radar, which we need; on joint use of the Russian missile systems for targeting purposes, which we want. But because none of the Missile Defense Agency, but because of the bureaucracy in the Pentagon, today we have no cooperative program with Russia, and that is unacceptable and it is outrageous.

So this amendment gets to the heart of the office of Secretary of Defense and the policy shop. You do not override the President of the United States. You are not the ultimate decision-makers above the Congress. The Congress made a conscientious bipartisan veto-proof effort in passing H.R. 4 in 1998. We were the ones that called for this cooperation. The President has said this repeatedly, and this amendment says to those bureaucrats in the policy shop, do your job.

I thank my colleagues for their effort. I ask all of my colleagues to support this because this is about our word. This is about the trust of America. This is about building a relationship that our Missile Defense Agency wants.

General Obering was in my office 2 months ago with a policy person sitting across the room, and General Obering looked at him and said, I want to do this. What we are saying is we support General Obering. We support the Secretary of Defense. We support the President of the United States. And to those bureaucrats in the Pentagon, wake up and listen, because that is who this amendment is aimed at.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the amendment, but ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), has been a leader in the Congress on relations with Russia for some time. I reviewed his amendment, and I support it and would like to state several reasons for supporting it that I think others can readily identify with.

First of all, this is not a new idea. It has been talked about at least as long ago as Reagan's Presidency, when Mr. Reagan was trying to make the point that he did not necessarily seek nuclear dominance, and that he was ready to share certain parts of missile defense with the Russians if necessary to show that it was consistent with the balance of power between our two countries.

But today, if you want principle reasons, one reason to have an amendment

like this and the policy that it supports is to show the Russians that ballistic missile defense need not be perceived by them as adverse to their security. Just as our missiles are no longer explicitly targeted at the Russians, the ballistic missile defense systems we are building are not directed really at countering their systems, but of the adversaries.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) mentions two good reasons, two practical reasons, for making this amendment our policy. Number one, it is possible that the Russians could cooperate with us in allowing us to test specific elements of their tracking equipment of their own missile systems. And, number two, they have early warning radar that the Missile Defense Agency may find very useful. In fact, if we begin some day in the near future to install systems that will give us protection against threats like Iran, we may find the geography inside Russia is ideal geography, ideally located for the kind of early warning system and detection that we would need and want and would be preferable possibly to locating some of these systems in Eastern European countries.

So there are many good reasons at this point in time to support this policy and therefore to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), amendment No. 29 offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), amendment No. 26 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 336, noes 92, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

AYES—336

Abercrombie Dreier
Aderholt Duncan
Akin Edwards
Alexander Ehlers
Andrews Engel
Baca English (PA)
Bachus Etheridge
Baird Evans
Baker Everett
Barrett (SC) Fattah
Barrow Feeney
Bartlett (MD) Ferguson
Barton (TX) Fitzpatrick (PA)
Bass Flake
Bean Foley
Beauprez Forbes
Berkley Ford
Berman Fortenberry
Berry Fossella
Biggert Foxx
Bilirakis Franks (AZ)
Bishop (GA) Frelinghuysen
Bishop (NY) Gallegly
Bishop (UT) Garrett (NJ)
Blackburn Gerlach
Blunt Gibbons
Boehrlert Gilchrest
Boehner Gillmor
Bonilla Gingrey
Bonner Gohmert
Bono Gonzalez
Boozman Goode
Boren Goodlatte
Boswell Gordon
Boucher Granger
Boustany Graves
Boyd Green (WI)
Bradley (NH) Green, Gene
Brady (TX) Gutknecht
Brown, Corrine Hall
Brown-Waite, Harman
Ginny Harris
Burgess Hart
Burton (IN) Hayes
Butterfield Hayworth
Buyer Hefley
Calvert Hensarling
Camp Herger
Cannon Herseth
Cantor Higgins
Capito Hinojosa
Capuano Hobson
Cardin Hoekstra
Cardoza Holden
Carnahan Hooley
Carter Hostettler
Case Hoyer
Castle Hulshof
Chabot Hunter
Chocola Hyde
Clay Inglis (SC)
Cleaver Inslee
Clyburn Israel
Coble Issa
Cole (OK) Istook
Conaway Jefferson
Cooper Jenkins
Costa Jindal
Costello Johnson (CT)
Cox Johnson (IL)
Cramer Johnson, E. B.
Crenshaw Johnson, Sam
Cubin Jones (NC)
Cuellar Kanjorski
Culberson Keller
Cummings Kelly
Cunningham Kennedy (MN)
Davis (AL) Kennedy (RI)
Davis (CA) Kildee
Davis (FL) Kind
Davis (KY) King (IA)
Davis (TN) King (NY)
Davis, Jo Ann Kingston
Davis, Tom Kirk
Deal (GA) Kline
DeFazio Knollenberg
Delahunt Kolbe
DeLay Kuhl (NY)
Dent LaHood
Diaz-Balart, L. Langevin
Diaz-Balart, M. Lantos
Dicks Larsen (WA)
Doggett Latham
Doolittle LaTourette
Doyle Leach
Drake Lewis (CA)

Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCreery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood

Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney

Ackerman
Allen
Baldwin
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Carson
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dingell
Emanuel
Eshoo
Farr
Finer
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchev
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur

Brown (SC)
Chandler

Emerson
Hastings (WA)

NOT VOTING—5
□ 1935

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. BRADLEY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 316, not voting 5, as follows:

Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Rahall
Rangel
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

Millender-
McDonald

[Roll No. 219]

AYES—112

Abercrombie Hall
Allen Hart
Baird Hastings (FL)
Barrow Herseth
Bass Higgins
Boozman Boozman
Bradley (NH) Hinchey
Brady (PA) Hinojosa
Brown (OH) Holt
Brown, Corrine Hooley
Brown-Waite, Jackson-Lee
Ginny (TX)
Capito Jefferson
Capps Jenkins
Cardoza Jindal
Clay Johnson (CT)
Crowley Jones (OH)
Cuellar Kucinich
Davis (AL) LaHood
Davis, Jo Ann Langevin
Davis, Tom Larson (CT)
DeFazio LaTourette
Delahunt Lewis (GA)
DeLauro Lowey
Doyle Lynch
Ehlers Manzullo
Evans McCollum (MN)
Fattah McCotter
Fitzpatrick (PA) McNulty
Ford Melancon
Gallegly Menendez
Gerlach Michaud
Gibbons Mollohan
Gingrey Moore (WI)
Gohmert Moran (VA)
Gonzalez Murphy
Gordon Murtha
Green, Al Oberstar
Green, Gene Ortiz

NOES—316

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehrlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
Franks (AZ)
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach

Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussie

NOT VOTING—5

Bishop (UT)
Brown (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1944

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 300, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]
AYES—128
Abercrombie
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carson
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Conyers
Costello
Cummings
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dogggett
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Finer
Frank (MA)
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinojosa
Holt

NOES—300

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza

Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens

Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry

Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha

NOT VOTING—5

Brown (SC)
Emerson

□ 1952

Mr. BUTTERFIELD changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, this place and our accomplishments all depend on great staff people. And that is what we had in Mr. Robert Rangel, who has been the staff director over these last several terms on the Committee on Armed Services. He was a staff leader for some 18 years, heading up our great bipartisan staff, and he is now leaving.

I thought of all of the great descriptions of people who serve this Nation in uniform, that adherence to duty and honor and country, and I think those are the metrics by which Mr. Rangel has worked to serve our interests and serve the interests of the people of this country and to serve the interests of the people who wear the uniform of the United States.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me add a thank-you and it is a job well

done to Robert Rangel. Your professionalism, your friendship, your integrity, your hard work have served this institution well. You love this institution, we know that, and we are most appreciative of all you have done for us in a bipartisan way. You understand politics; but on the other hand, you understand this institution and help make it work very, very well.

I might say, Robert, back in Lafayette County, Missouri, the highest compliment you ever get is, You done good. So Robert Rangel, you done good.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1815) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 293, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. In its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1815 to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII (page 290, after line 5), add the following new section:

SEC. 707. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY OF SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (a) of section 1076d of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) ELIGIBILITY.—A member” and inserting “(a) ELIGIBILITY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member”;

(2) by striking “after the member completes” and all that follows through “one or more whole years following such date”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to a member who is enrolled, or is eligible to enroll, in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5.”.

(b) CONDITION FOR TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking “(b) PERIOD OF COVERAGE.—(1) TRICARE Standard” and all that follows through “(3) Eligibility” and inserting “(b) TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY UPON TERMINATION OF SERVICE.—Eligibility”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Such section is further amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (e) and transferring such subsection within such section so as to appear following subsection (d).

(2) The heading for such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 1076d. TRICARE program: TRICARE standard coverage for members of the selected reserve”.

(d) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION.—Section 1076b of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 1076b; and

(2) by striking the item relating to section 1076d and inserting the following:

“1076d. TRICARE program: TRICARE Standard coverage for members of the Selected Reserve.”.

(f) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Enrollments in TRICARE Standard that are in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act under section 1076d of title 10, United States Code, as in effect on such day, shall be continued until terminated after such day under such section 1076d as amended by this section.

Page 508, line 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$182,000,000)”.

Page 509, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$182,000,000)”.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER), in speaking to the Woolsey amendment, described it as a message-sender. This motion to recommit, which is an amendment to the bill, is a message-sender.

This is a message-sender to the Guardsmen and Reservists of this Nation who comprise 38 percent of the total force, and who at this moment comprise 40 percent of the men and

women who are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. By the way, they provide about that same percentage of the wounded, about the same percentage of the people who come home dead from that war.

See, unlike the regular soldier to their right and the regular Marine to their left, who are guaranteed health care coverage through the TRICARE program, 20 percent of our Guardsmen and Reservists have no health care coverage whatsoever. Coincidentally, about 20 percent of our Guard and Reservists who are called up could not be deployed because they were not medically ready to be deployed. This amendment addresses that.

This amendment would take \$185 million out of the fund that is going to fund base closure and apply it to TRICARE for Guard and Reservists to let those people know we appreciate them.

□ 2000

Why is this important? Just today in south Mississippi, five families got the worst message you could ever receive, and that is that their loved one died in Iraq. Every one of them was a Guardsman or Reservist. Last Friday, I visited Walter Reed just like all of you do, but a little bit different from my colleagues, just to see Mississippians. Every one of the five Mississippians that are there are Guardsmen or Reservists. One is a double amputee. The other two have lost one leg. The other two are in wheelchairs and will be for some time. Every one of them is a Guardsman or Reservist.

I have heard in committee that maybe the Guard and Reserve does not deserve this. What could be farther from the truth? There are people who say, Well, we can't afford the money. It is going to be expensive. I am not going to lie about that. When it is fully implemented, it is going to cost \$1 billion a year. But I will also remind you that when it is fully implemented, that will amount to one-quarter of 1 percent of the entire DOD budget, one-quarter of 1 percent of the DOD budget so we can tell our Guardsmen, so we can tell our Reservists, and there are really only three types of Guardsmen and Reservists, because I know a bunch of them. There are those that have been to Iraq, there are those that are in Iraq, and there are those that are going to Iraq. That is the only type of Guardsmen and Reservists we have now. That is how much we use them in the force. As a matter of fact, the aviation classification repair unit that is shared in the district of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS) and my own has already been to Iraq and they have been told they are going back.

This is going to become law. It is going to become law. The question is whether the House is going to lead on this or whether we are going to follow, because tomorrow the Senator from South Carolina is going to offer this amendment, and it is going to pass. So

then it goes to conference. One of the arguments that is going to be made is that by this motion to recommit, we are slowing the process down. I would beg to differ. By this motion to recommit, we are stating the House's position that we agree with you, that this is something that is worthwhile to do and we go to conference, we are already in agreement that we are going to provide TRICARE for our Guardsmen and Reservists. I think it is a pretty good idea, but that is just me. But there are a lot of other folks who think this is a good idea.

This motion to recommit has been endorsed by the Military Officers Association of America, by the National Guard Association of America, by the Enlisted Association of the National Guard, a unanimous vote last weekend by the Adjutants General of the 54 States and territories, the Reserve Officers Association, and the Fleet Reserve Association.

Mr. Chairman, we are all going to go to Memorial Day services on Monday. A heck of a lot of people in that crowd are going to be Guardsmen, Reservists and their families. They are going to know how we voted. So you can plan to maybe duck some and hide from some, you can give them some lame excuse that, well, it wasn't what my party wanted, it wasn't what my chairman wanted; or you can look that young person who in the next year might be the father of a child and say, You're a National Guardsman. You're a Reservist. We as a Nation are willing to help you pay for that child.

Who in the next year may have cancer in their family, we are saying, Doggone it, you're serving your country. We're there to help you for that. Or that you have a preexisting condition. We all know how hard it is for someone who has a loved one with a preexisting condition to get insurance. We are telling them we value your service.

On Monday, when you look them in the eye, I hope you will be in a position to say we appreciate your service. You were there for us. And last Wednesday night, I was there for you.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, my good colleague from Mississippi has spoken of our great Guardsmen and Reservists a number of times in his very eloquent statement and talked about their deployment, their imminent deployment, or the deployment they are involved in right now or the one they are returning from in Afghanistan, Iraq, or other places around the world.

We, in fact, do provide TRICARE. It is medical care for every one of them and every one of their dependents, for 90 days before mobilization and 180 days after mobilization.

So this body, starting with the Committee on Armed Services and then the

full House, moving and working with the Senate and with the President, have done that. Now, let me just tell you, there is a major problem from my perspective and I have looked at this during the last session and you have a major, major problem, because all of these people have jobs, they have employers who are carrying health care in the private sector right now. If you give an opportunity to employers, to the private sector, to terminate the health care that they are providing right now to their employees, once they understand that the government will pick up that health care pursuant to that status in the Guard, across the board, you are going to see that 18 percent of Guardsmen who right now do not have that health care, you are going to see that number go way up in the private sector and you are going to see, very simply, a large displacement of that burden from the private sector on to the DOD budget.

That gets to another responsibility that everyone here has. We have a responsibility to replace those 18-year-old helicopters. We have a responsibility to replace those jet aircraft that average now in the Navy about 17½ years old. We have a responsibility to replace those tanks, those trucks, those ships. If we take that \$5.8 billion that this will amount to over 5 years, much of which will be the shifting of this burden from the private sector to DOD, we may think we have served that Guardsman very well in one way, but we will disserve him in another way because he will not have the best equipment.

Let me get to the issue at hand. We have a \$500 billion bill which provides the tools to get the job done in this war against terror. The war really started when Todd Beamer, when that United flight was over Pennsylvania and he took on the terrorists and the last words we heard from him were, Let's roll. Let's roll echoed across the mountains of Afghanistan, through those dark canyons and those caves, across the sands of Iraq; and right now it is being carried in units like the 10th Mountain Division, the First Marine Division out to the western AO in Iraq, the First Armored Division in Baghdad, and all those great Guardsmen and Reservists who are fighting in this war against terror. We have provided in this bill the tools to get the job done.

Let us pass this bill. Let's roll.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE
Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair

will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 218, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

AYES—211

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Abercrombie | Green, Al | Oberstar |
| Ackerman | Green, Gene | Obey |
| Allen | Grijalva | Oliver |
| Andrews | Gutierrez | Ortiz |
| Baca | Harman | Owens |
| Baird | Hastings (FL) | Pallone |
| Baldwin | Hersteth | Pascrell |
| Barrow | Higgins | Pastor |
| Bean | Hinchev | Paul |
| Becerra | Hinojosa | Payne |
| Berkley | Holden | Pelosi |
| Berman | Holt | Peterson (MN) |
| Berry | Honda | Pomeroy |
| Bishop (GA) | Hoolley | Price (NC) |
| Bishop (NY) | Hoyer | Rahall |
| Blumenauer | Inslee | Ramstad |
| Boren | Israel | Rangel |
| Boswell | Jackson (IL) | Reyes |
| Boucher | Jackson-Lee | Ross |
| Boyd | (TX) | Rothman |
| Brady (PA) | Jefferson | Roybal-Allard |
| Brown (OH) | Johnson, E. B. | Ruppersberger |
| Brown, Corrine | Jones (NC) | Rush |
| Brown-Waite, | Jones (OH) | Ryan (OH) |
| Ginny | Kanjorski | Sabo |
| Butterfield | Kaptur | Salazar |
| Capps | Kennedy (RI) | Sanchez, Linda |
| Capuano | Kildee | T. |
| Cardin | Kilpatrick (MI) | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Cardoza | Kind | Sanders |
| Carnahan | Kucinich | Schakowsky |
| Carson | Langevin | Schiff |
| Case | Lantos | Schwartz (PA) |
| Chandler | Larsen (WA) | Scott (GA) |
| Clay | Larson (CT) | Scott (VA) |
| Cleaver | Latham | Serrano |
| Clyburn | Leach | Shays |
| Conyers | Lee | Sherman |
| Cooper | Levin | Skelton |
| Costa | Lewis (GA) | Slaughter |
| Costello | Lipinski | Smith (WA) |
| Cramer | Lofgren, Zoe | Snyder |
| Crowley | Lowey | Solis |
| Cuellar | Lynch | Spratt |
| Cummings | Maloney | Stark |
| Davis (AL) | Markey | Strickland |
| Davis (CA) | Marshall | Stupak |
| Davis (FL) | Matheson | Tanner |
| Davis (IL) | Matsui | Tauscher |
| Davis (TN) | McCarthy | Taylor (MS) |
| DeFazio | McCollum (MN) | Thompson (CA) |
| DeGette | McDermott | Thompson (MS) |
| Delahunt | McGovern | Tierney |
| DeLauro | McIntyre | Towns |
| Dicks | McKinney | Udall (CO) |
| Dingell | McNulty | Udall (NM) |
| Doggett | Meehan | Van Hollen |
| Doyle | Meek (FL) | Velázquez |
| Edwards | Meeks (NY) | Vislousky |
| Emanuel | Melancon | Wasserman |
| Engel | Menendez | Schultz |
| Eshoo | Michaud | Waters |
| Etheridge | Miller (NC) | Watson |
| Evans | Miller, George | Watt |
| Farr | Mollohan | Waxman |
| Fattah | Moore (KS) | Weiner |
| Filner | Moore (WI) | Wexler |
| Ford | Moran (VA) | Wilson (NM) |
| Frank (MA) | Murtha | Woolsey |
| Gonzalez | Nadler | Wu |
| Goode | Napolitano | Wynn |
| Gordon | Neal (MA) | |

NOES—218

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| Aderholt | Blunt | Camp |
| Akin | Boehert | Cannon |
| Alexander | Boehner | Cantor |
| Bachus | Bonilla | Capito |
| Baker | Bonner | Carter |
| Barrett (SC) | Bono | Castle |
| Bartlett (MD) | Boozman | Chabot |
| Barton (TX) | Boustany | Choccola |
| Bass | Bradley (NH) | Coble |
| Beauprez | Brady (TX) | Cole (OK) |
| Biggert | Burgess | Conaway |
| Bilirakis | Burton (IN) | Cox |
| Bishop (UT) | Buyer | Crenshaw |
| Blackburn | Calvert | Cubin |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Culberson | Jindal | Pombo | Bass | Etheridge | Lewis (KY) | Roybal-Allard | Simpson | Turner |
| Cunningham | Johnson (CT) | Porter | Bean | Evans | Linder | Royce | Skelton | Udall (CO) |
| Davis (KY) | Johnson (IL) | Price (GA) | Beauprez | Everett | Lipinski | Ruppersberger | Slaughter | Udall (NM) |
| Davis, Jo Ann | Johnson, Sam | Pryce (OH) | Becerra | Farr | LoBiondo | Ryan (OH) | Smith (NJ) | Upton |
| Davis, Tom | Keller | Putnam | Berkley | Fattah | Lofgren, Zoe | Ryan (WI) | Smith (TX) | Van Hollen |
| Deal (GA) | Kelly | Radanovich | Berman | Feeney | Lowey | Ryun (KS) | Smith (WA) | Visclosky |
| DeLay | Kennedy (MN) | Regula | Berry | Ferguson | Lucas | Sabo | Snyder | Walden (OR) |
| Dent | King (IA) | Rehberg | Biggert | Fitzpatrick (PA) | Lungren, Daniel | Salazar | Sodrel | Walsh |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | King (NY) | Reichert | Bilirakis | Flake | E. | Sánchez, Linda | Souder | Wamp |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Kingston | Renzi | Bishop (GA) | Foley | Lynch | T. | Spratt | Wasserman |
| Doolittle | Kirk | Reynolds | Bishop (NY) | Forbes | Mack | Sanchez, Loretta | Stearns | Schultz |
| Drake | Kline | Rogers (AL) | Bishop (UT) | Ford | Maloney | Sanders | Strickland | Watson |
| Dreier | Knollenberg | Rogers (KY) | Blackburn | Portenberry | Manzullo | Saxton | Stupak | Waxman |
| Duncan | Kolbe | Rogers (MI) | Blunt | Fossella | Marchant | Schiff | Sullivan | Weiner |
| Ehlers | Kuhl (NY) | Rohrabacher | Boehlert | Fox | Fox | Schwartz (PA) | Sweeney | Weldon (FL) |
| English (PA) | LaHood | Ros-Lehtinen | Boehner | Franks (AZ) | Marshall | Schwarz (MI) | Tancred | Weldon (PA) |
| Everett | LaTourette | Royce | Bonilla | Frelinghuysen | Matheson | Scott (GA) | Tanner | Weller |
| Feeney | Lewis (CA) | Ryan (WI) | Bonner | Galleghy | Matsui | Scott (VA) | Tauscher | Westmoreland |
| Ferguson | Lewis (KY) | Ryun (KS) | Bono | Garrett (NJ) | McCarthy | Sensenbrenner | Taylor (MS) | Wexler |
| Fitzpatrick (PA) | Linder | Saxton | Boozman | Gerlach | McCaul (TX) | Sessions | Taylor (NC) | Whitfield |
| Flake | LoBiondo | Schwarz (MI) | Boren | Gibbons | McCollum (MN) | Shadegg | Terry | Wicker |
| Foley | Lucas | Sensenbrenner | Bowell | Gilchrist | McCotter | Shaw | Thomas | Wilson (NM) |
| Forbes | Lungren, Daniel | Sessions | Boucher | Gillmor | McCrery | Shays | Thompson (CA) | Wilson (SC) |
| Fortenberry | E. | Shadegg | Boustany | Gingrey | McHenry | Sherman | Thompson (MS) | Wolf |
| Fossella | Mack | Shaw | Boyd | Gingrey | McHugh | Sherwood | Thornberry | Wynn |
| Fox | Manzullo | Sherwood | Bradley (NH) | Gohmert | McIntyre | Shimkus | Tiaht | Young (AK) |
| Franks (AZ) | Marchant | Shimkus | Brady (PA) | Gonzalez | McKeone | Shuster | Tiabt | Young (FL) |
| Frelinghuysen | McCaul (TX) | Shuster | Brady (TX) | Goode | McMorris | Simmons | Towns | |
| Galleghy | McCotter | Simmons | Brown (OH) | Goodlatte | McNulty | | | |
| Garrett (NJ) | McCrery | Simpson | Brown, Corrine | Gordon | Meehan | | | |
| Gerlach | McHenry | Smith (NJ) | Brown-Waite, | Granger | Meek (FL) | Baldwin | Jones (OH) | Payne |
| Gibbons | McHugh | Smith (TX) | Ginny | Graves | Meeks (NY) | Blumenauer | Kilpatrick (MI) | Rangel |
| Gilchrist | McKeon | Sodrel | Burgess | Green (WI) | Melancon | Conyers | Kucinich | Rush |
| Gillmor | McMorris | Souder | Burton (IN) | Green, Al | Menendez | Davis (IL) | Lee | Schakowsky |
| Gingrey | Mica | Stearns | Butterfield | Green, Gene | | Delahunt | Lewis (GA) | Serrano |
| Gohmert | Miller (FL) | Sullivan | Buyer | Gutknecht | | Duncan | McDermott | Solis |
| Goodlatte | Miller (MI) | Sweeney | Calvert | Hall | | Filner | McGovern | Stark |
| Granger | Miller, Gary | Tancred | Camp | Harman | | Miller (FL) | McKinney | Tierney |
| Graves | Moran (KS) | Taylor (NC) | Cannon | Harris | | Miller (MI) | Moore (WI) | Velázquez |
| Green (WI) | Murphy | Terry | Cantor | Hart | | Miller (NC) | Oberstar | Waters |
| Gutknecht | Musgrave | Thomas | Capito | Hayes | | Miller, Gary | Hastings (FL) | Watt |
| Hall | Myrick | Thornberry | Capps | Hayworth | | Miller, George | Hinchev | Woolsey |
| Harris | Neugebauer | Tiaht | Cardin | Hefley | | Mollohan | Jackson (IL) | Wu |
| Hart | Ney | Tiberi | Cardoza | Hensarling | | Moore (KS) | | |
| Hayes | Northup | Turner | Cardahan | Herger | | Moran (KS) | | |
| Hayworth | Norwood | Upton | Carson | Herseth | | Moran (VA) | | |
| Hefley | Nunes | Walden (OR) | Carnahan | Higgins | | Murphy | | |
| Hensarling | Nussle | Walsh | Carson | Hinojosa | | Murtha | | |
| Herger | Osborne | Wamp | Carter | Hobson | | Musgrave | | |
| Hobson | Otter | Weldon (FL) | Case | Hoekstra | | Myrick | | |
| Hoekstra | Oxley | Weldon (PA) | Castle | Holden | | Nadler | | |
| Hostettler | Pearce | Weller | Chabot | Holt | | Napolitano | | |
| Hulshof | Pence | Westmoreland | Chandler | Honda | | Neal (MA) | | |
| Hunter | Peterson (PA) | Whitfield | Chocola | Hooley | | Neugebauer | | |
| Hyde | Petri | Wicker | Clay | Hostettler | | Ney | | |
| Inglis (SC) | Pickering | Wilson (SC) | Cleaver | Hoyer | | Northup | | |
| Issa | Pitts | Wolf | Clyburn | Hulshof | | Norwood | | |
| Istook | Platts | Young (AK) | Coble | Hunter | | Nunes | | |
| Jenkins | Poe | Young (FL) | Cole (OK) | Hyde | | Nussle | | |
| | | | Conaway | Inglis (SC) | | Obe | | |
| | | | Cooper | Inslee | | Ortiz | | |
| | | | Costa | Israel | | Osborne | | |
| | | | Costello | Issa | | Otter | | |
| | | | Cox | Istook | | Oxley | | |
| | | | Cramer | Jackson-Lee | | Pallone | | |
| | | | Crenshaw | (TX) | | Pascrell | | |
| | | | Crowley | Jefferson | | Pastor | | |
| | | | Cubin | Jenkins | | Pearce | | |
| | | | Cuellar | Jindal | | Pelosi | | |
| | | | Culberson | Johnson (CT) | | Pence | | |
| | | | Cummings | Johnson (IL) | | Peterson (MN) | | |
| | | | Cunningham | Johnson (IL) | | Peterson (PA) | | |
| | | | Davis (AL) | Johnson, E. B. | | Petri | | |
| | | | Davis (CA) | Johnson, Sam | | Pickering | | |
| | | | Davis (FL) | Jones (NC) | | Pitts | | |
| | | | Davis (KY) | Kanjorski | | Platts | | |
| | | | Davis (TN) | Kaptur | | Poe | | |
| | | | Davis, Jo Ann | Keller | | Pombo | | |
| | | | Davis, Tom | Kelly | | Pomeroy | | |
| | | | Deal (GA) | Kennedy (MN) | | Porter | | |
| | | | DeFazio | Kennedy (RI) | | Price (GA) | | |
| | | | DeGette | Kildee | | Price (NC) | | |
| | | | DeLauro | Kind | | Pryce (OH) | | |
| | | | DeLay | King (IA) | | Putnam | | |
| | | | Dent | King (NY) | | Radanovich | | |
| | | | Diaz-Balart, L. | Kingston | | Rahall | | |
| | | | Diaz-Balart, M. | Kirk | | Ramstad | | |
| | | | Dicks | Kline | | Regula | | |
| | | | Dingell | Knollenberg | | Rehberg | | |
| | | | Doggett | Kolbe | | Reichert | | |
| | | | Doolittle | Kuhl (NY) | | Renzi | | |
| | | | Doyle | LaHood | | Reyes | | |
| | | | Drake | Langevin | | Rantos | | |
| | | | Dreier | Larsen (WA) | | Rogers (AL) | | |
| | | | Edwards | Larson (CT) | | Rogers (KY) | | |
| | | | Ehlers | Latham | | Rogers (MI) | | |
| | | | Emanuel | LaTourette | | Rohrabacher | | |
| | | | Engel | Leach | | Ros-Lehtinen | | |
| | | | English (PA) | Levin | | Ross | | |
| | | | Eshoo | Lewis (CA) | | Rothman | | |

NOT VOTING—4

| | | |
|------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Brown (SC) | Hastings (WA) | Millender-McDonald |
| Emerson | | |

□ 2026

Mr. WHITFIELD changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 39, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

YEAS—390

| | | |
|-------------|---------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Allen | Baker |
| Ackerman | Andrews | Barrett (SC) |
| Aderholt | Baca | Barrow |
| Akin | Bachus | Bartlett (MD) |
| Alexander | Baird | Barton (TX) |

NAYS—39

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|------------|
| Baldwin | Jones (OH) | Payne |
| Blumenauer | Kilpatrick (MI) | Rangel |
| Conyers | Kucinich | Rush |
| Davis (IL) | Lee | Schakowsky |
| Delahunt | Lewis (GA) | Serrano |
| Duncan | McDermott | Solis |
| Filner | McGovern | Stark |
| Frank (MA) | McKinney | Tierney |
| Grijalva | Moore (WI) | Velázquez |
| Gutierrez | Oberstar | Waters |
| Hastings (FL) | Olver | Watt |
| Hinchev | Owens | Woolsey |
| Jackson (IL) | Paul | Wu |

NOT VOTING—4

| | | |
|------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Brown (SC) | Hastings (WA) | Millender-McDonald |
| Emerson | | |

□ 2037

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the committee amendment to the title is adopted.

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment to the title is as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE STAFF

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me extend my thanks, and I know on the other side of the aisle the leadership and membership extend their thanks, to all of our great staff people who did such a wonderful job putting this bill together and bringing it to the House floor. We appreciate them.