

to assist the Metropolitan Police Department, including the Federal Protective Service, the largest Federal force to participate. Now over 400 officers are assisting D.C. police.

Federal agencies understand that the extension of their jurisdiction will enhance safety and security within and around their agencies, while offering needed assistance as well to District residents. The Capitol Police and Amtrak police, who have the longest experience with expanded jurisdiction, report that the morale of their officers was affected positively because of the satisfaction that comes from being integrated into efforts to reduce and prevent crime in and around their agencies and in the Nation's capital.

This non-controversial technical amendment to the Police Coordination Act is another step toward achieving my goal of assuring the most efficient use of all the available police resources to protect Federal agency staff, visitors, commuters, and D.C. residents. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2199.

Once again, I thank the chairman for her work on this bill.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my thanks to the sponsor of the legislation, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her leadership on these issues. I urge unanimity supporting this important bill to coordinate the police action in the District of Columbia to provide for further public safety and reduction of crime.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2199.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2586, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 246 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 246

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2586) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military activities of the Depart-

ment of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes. No further amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a rule providing for further consideration of H.R. 2586, the fiscal year 2002 Department of Defense Authorization Act. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution, which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against such amendments. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows us to finish up our work on the defense bill. All of us on both sides of the aisle recognize that we must provide for our military in this time of crisis. The gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) deserve great credit for coming together this week to grease the skids on this bill.

The rule simply ratifies their agreement by providing for five amendments. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), who is managing the rule for the minority, worked hard on one of these amendments. In the wake of the

terrorist attacks 2 weeks ago, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Frost) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) worked to ensure that the Pentagon commends its civilian employees who are killed and injured by terrorist attacks by awarding them a medal for the defense of freedom. This is a new medal to recognize civilian Department of Defense employees who are injured in the line of duty.

The rule makes in order another amendment that I strongly oppose, an amendment to allow abortions on our military bases overseas. There is no place for abortion at our sensitive foreign bases.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in addition to a noncontroversial manager's amendment, the rule provides for two amendments that would beef up our military's ability to fight terrorism. All of America realizes how important this is. We can leave nothing to chance. The primary purpose of our Federal Government is to defend our citizens, and the military is our primary source of that defense.

The need for these amendments is all too clear. We must act quickly to give our men and women the tools that they need to patrol our borders and prevent terrorist attacks to protect us.

So let us pass this rule and pass the underlying defense authorization bill. At the end of the day, we will have provided \$343 billion to our Armed Forces, the largest increase in support for our military since the 1980s. At this crucial time in our history, this bill is most important.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by saying that I am glad that today the House of Representatives will complete this bill, H.R. 2586, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002. It is a good example of the bipartisan support America's Armed Forces enjoy. It passed the Committee on Armed Services on a bipartisan vote of 58 to 1. That is because Democrats and Republicans are strongly committed to a first-rate military that will protect this Nation and its people and that will maintain our position as the chief protector of democracy and the rule of law throughout the world.

Since the horror of September 11, Mr. Speaker, America's commitment to the finest military in the world has only become stronger. That is clear from the hard work that went into reaching bipartisan consensus in this rule.

In the interest of national unity, several of the military's strongest defenders on the Democratic side agreed to forego important priorities. For example, I am disappointed that the manager's amendment strips out the provision of the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to make contracting procedures more equitable for Department of Defense civilian employees, a provision that was passed by the Committee on Armed Services. Last night,

Democrats on the Committee on Rules tried to restore this important provision, but failed in a party line vote. I hope that we can revisit this issue at a later date.

On the other hand, I am pleased that there is bipartisan support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). It provides \$400 million for intelligence and counterterrorism initiatives by reducing the President's request for national missile defense. It reflects how America's national defense priorities have changed since September 11.

The rule also makes in order an amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) to restore equal access to health services at overseas military hospitals for service men and women and their dependents stationed overseas.

Finally, I personally appreciate the work of the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) and the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) to recognize the sacrifice of Defense Department civilians killed or injured at the Pentagon on September 11. The amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) is a sense of the Congress resolution commending the Defense Department's decision to create a new award, a medal for the defense of freedom, to be awarded to Defense Department civilian employees killed or wounded as a result of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, we urge the Secretary of Defense to move quickly to produce and present this new medal. These medals are typically awarded about the time of burial, and the Defense Department is now in the process of identifying the civilians killed in the September 11 attack on the Pentagon.

Until 1998, Mr. Speaker, civilian employees of the Defense Department were eligible for the Purple Heart, an honor begun by the Kennedy administration and continued during the Reagan Administration. The amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman STUMP) would ensure that once again they can receive the recognition they deserve for their service to America.

As for the bill itself, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that it makes crucial quality of life improvements by raising military pay, improving military housing, and ensuring medical care for military retirees for the men and women of the Armed Forces and their families.

I am also pleased that the Committee on Armed Services has continued its commitment to the wide range of weapons programs that ensure our military's superiority throughout the world. The bill includes \$865 million for research and development of the F-22 Raptor, the next generation air dominance fighter for the Air Force, as well as \$2.7 billion for 13 low-rate initial production aircraft, and \$379 million for advance procurement of 24 LRIP aircraft in fiscal year 2003.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2586 also includes \$1.5 billion for continued development of the Joint Strike fighter and \$1 billion for the procurement of 12 MV-22 helicopters. These aircraft are important components in our national arsenal, and moving forward on their research and development sends a clear signal that the United States has no intention of relinquishing our air superiority.

Mr. Speaker, the first duty of the Congress is to provide for the national defense and the men and women who protect it. This bipartisan bill does a great deal to improve military readiness and to improve the quality of life of our men and women in uniform, as well as for their families. For that reason, I urge the adoption of this rule and of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ).

Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the House today finally agrees on a rule to approve H.R. 2586, that will authorize the adequate funds for the Defense Department at this critical time, but I want to clarify some issues with regard to Puerto Ricans and Puerto Rico's commitment at this moment to the Nation.

Puerto Ricans will continue to support this great Nation and President George W. Bush in efforts to fight against the horrific elements of terrorism. Let no one question our commitment. Governor Calderon and I have reached out to support those directly impacted by the cowardly acts of September 11, 2001. Some 800 Puerto Ricans died that day in the Pentagon and in New York. We stand in steadfast support of efforts to realize justice and to heal the many wounds inflicted on America. We recognize that this bill works toward that commitment.

Nevertheless, I am concerned, however, about language contained in the chairman's mark that would, if enacted, alter the commitment of the Navy to find sufficient alternative training grounds to Vieques by May 1, 2003. I am also concerned about how this change in policy will be received in Puerto Rico should it become law. We reaffirm our support of President Bush's position that there is no need for another referendum and that the Navy depart Vieques on or before May 1, 2003.

Furthermore, since Navy Secretary Gordon England yesterday stated in a letter dated September 24, 2001, to Senate Committee on Armed Services Committee Chairman LEVIN that the Navy will meet its goal of May 1, 2003, there is no need to change the existing commitment. Such a change would create confusion and distrust in Vieques. We do not need that at this time of national unity.

I am confident that the President, this House, and the Senate will comply with the commitment made to the people of Vieques that the Navy will leave Vieques by 2003.

I want my colleagues to appreciate how committed Puerto Ricans are to our national defense. All of the recruitment goals of the armed services have been surpassed in Puerto Rico over the last 4 years. Even as this issue has been discussed on the island, young Puerto Ricans enlist to serve our Nation in numbers that increase year after year and exceed recruiting goals of our armed services, including the Navy.

Puerto Rico's support of this Nation is unconditional. However, I believe that the administration can still meet the commitment to find alternatives to Vieques by May 1, 2003.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the gentleman from Puerto Rico that I hope he will accept our condolences for all of the people of Puerto Rico who lost their lives in that senseless act.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. Both the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and I had asked that amendments be made in order that deal with base closure. They were not made in order; but in the spirit of comity, we understand why that is the situation.

However, the other body has clearly made its preferences clear, and this will be an item at conference. Secretary Rumsfeld also made a very strong statement within the last 24 hours that he believes the events of 2 weeks ago in Washington and New York bring home even more the importance of finding dollars to save as we transform our military into dealing with the threats of the future. So while we will not have any language in this defense bill today that deals with base closure, I believe that at conference, we need to improve the language of the Senate so that those communities that go through this process hopefully can have more peace of mind than they did in previous rounds of base closure. We need to do base closure, and at some point we will save an additional \$3 billion a year that can go into items that we need to deal with the threats of the future.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to oppose this rule.

I find at a time when we are getting ready to ask another generation of Americans to lay their lives on the line for our Nation, that we are now willing to fulfill a promise made to previous generations of Americans who have served our country. One of the many promises that were made to the men and women in uniform was the promise of free lifetime health care. The implied promise for almost all of those people who served and enlisted back then was that the base hospital would

be made available to them for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, last year, after some effort to get an amendment to the floor, 406 of my colleagues voted to pass something called Medicare subvention, which would allow 65-year-old military retirees to use the base hospital and for Medicare to reimburse that base hospital so that there was no cost to the DOD for providing health care to our Nation's military retirees. Our military retirees, like every other American, pay Medicare taxes. This would allow them to take those Medicare taxes to the doctor of their choice.

Unfortunately, the other body, after we passed that by such a large vote, chose not to include that in the final version of the defense authorization bill. They took our language that said "you must do it" and said "you may do it." Unfortunately, events have shown that neither HCFA, which is Medicare, nor the DOD could reach an agreement on the compensation.

So now, because the Committee on Rules said we would have to waive the budget rule, we cannot take care of our Nation's military retirees. I guess the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and I would be the only two guys in this room to know that there is a song by the Isley Brothers called "Harvest for the World." The rhetorical question is why do those who pay the price come home with the least? Mr. Speaker, if these Americans have paid the price, then why are they coming home with the least?

We are told that for hundreds of millions of dollars, we cannot reimburse the base hospitals with their own Medicare money. Mr. Speaker, 31 times this year, the Committee on Rules has seen fit to waive the budget rules; but almost always, it was for someone who had a big PAC, folks who made big contributions. Well, military retirees do not have big PACs; and they do not make big contributions, not the least donation-wise. What they have done is contributed their lives to our Nation, and we are not even willing to see to it that we can keep the promise to them.

So I am going to oppose this rule, and I would ask my fellow colleagues to oppose it.

I would also like to point out that one more budget tightening that is going on has to do with concurrent receipt. Federal employees who are disabled on the workplace are allowed to draw their disability and their retirement pay. Once again, the only Americans who are singled out to get one or the other are our Nation's military retirees. As the President just pointed out, we are going to have casualties in this war against terrorism; and if those casualties happen to have been someone who served our Nation for 20 years or more, and if they become disabled as a result of their military service, they will get their disability; but it will be deducted from their retirement pay.

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues, the Committee on Rules, I want the

gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) of the Committee on Ways and Means, I want somebody to come to this floor and tell me that that is fair. Just last week we bailed out the airlines, and I voted for it, and some of the people we bailed out make \$20 million and \$30 million a year to run those companies, and they have not run them very well. We have seen to it that the wealthiest 5 percent of all Americans got more than their fair share of 1 trillion, 200 billion dollars worth of tax breaks; but we cannot take care of folks who have been disabled serving their country, and we cannot honor the promise of lifetime health care to our Nation's military retirees.

I want the Speaker of the House, I want the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), I want someone to come forward and just tell me if they think that is fair, because if we are willing to do it behind the cloak of secrecy, if we are willing to get the folks on the Committee on Rules to do our dirty work for us, then please do not have the nerve 2 months from now to go to Veterans' Day celebrations, and when that military retiree comes to you and says, you know what, they will not let me in the base hospital, and when that disabled veteran comes to you, and says, you know what, I can get my military pay or disability pay, but I have earned both of them, and I cannot get both, you can look that guy in the eye and say, well, I was not aware of that, and maybe he will forget about it a year from November, or you can tell him the truth: yes, I knew you had a problem, but we were trying to move that bill along, so we just ignored you one more time.

Just last week we found \$18 billion to bail out the airlines. The week before that we allocated \$40 billion additional defense funds, but not one of those pennies is allocated to solve either one of these problems. Does somebody want to tell me that is right? This defense bill is more famous for what it does not do. It does not balance the budget. As of the end of August, even before the tragedy on September 11, our Nation was \$31 billion in the red, again. It does not build ships. At the rate we are going, we are losing 15 ships a year, that is the impact, and headed towards a 200 ship fleet. I say to my colleagues, not the 400-ship fleet of just a few years ago and not the 600-ship fleet of the Reagan years. So someone tell me where the heck all the money goes and why we cannot set better priorities.

So for a lot of reasons, on behalf of my 405 colleagues who supported Medicare subvention last year, and who only asked for a fair up and down vote on that issue so that we can fulfill the promise to our Nation's military retirees, I ask my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers. I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1747

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McHUGH) at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 25, 2001.
Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 25, 2001 at 4:41 p.m.

That the Senate PASSED without amendment H.J. Res. 65.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 246 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2586.

□ 1748

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2586) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BIGGERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, September 20, 2001, proceedings pursuant to the order of the House of